

Class

280.3Q

Book

K617p

General Theological Seminary Library

Chelsea Square, New York

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by

EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.

DEAN 1879-1902

PRINCIPLES
OF
ANGLICANISM

PRINCIPLES
OF
ANGLICANISM

BY

FREDERICK JOSEPH KINSMAN,
M.A.(Oxon.), D.D.(Berk.)
BISHOP OF DELAWARE

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
LONDON, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA
1910

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK

LONDON, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA

280.3Q

K617p

52293

COPYRIGHT, 1910, BY
LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

Published, December, 1910

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

LIBRARY

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

To

PHILIP MERCER RHINELANDER

PREFACE

THE six papers contained in this volume are sufficiently connected in thought and treatment to allow of publication under one title, although they were written in the first instance for different sets of people and bear plain traces of independent preparation. In spite of repetitions and other incongruities, they are published in substantially their original form.

The first three lectures on *Principles of Anglicanism* were delivered on the foundation of the Reinicker Lectureship in the Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, in November 1909; the fourth, on *The Principle of Orders*, was read before the Brooklyn Clerical League in March 1910; the fifth, on *The Achievements and Failures of Protestantism*, was written for the St. Mary's Conference, Raleigh, N. C., in June 1910; the sixth, on *Church Unity*, is a sermon preached at St. John's Church, Wilmington, and later at Grace Church, Avondale, Cincinnati, in October 1910. The first five papers were read at the St. Mary's Conference in Raleigh, and later at a Conference for Church-workers held at the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, in July 1910. The publication was asked for by those attending the two conferences; but this would not have been accomplished, had it not been for the advice and

assistance of the Rev. Professor Philip Mercer Rhinelander of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge my supreme obligations to Professor Rhinelander for encouragement in this as in every undertaking of my life; as well as gratitude to the Bishop of Vermont and Miss Elizabeth Houghton of Cambridge for help in arranging for the publication; to the Rev. Dr. William T. Manning, rector of Trinity Parish, New York, for helpful criticism of one of the papers; and to my sister for constant assistance in preparing manuscript for the press.

F. J. K.

Bishopstead,
WILMINGTON, DELAWARE,
St. Simon and St. Jude's Day, 1910.

CONTENTS

PRINCIPLES OF ANGLICANISM

I. THE ENGLISH REFORMATION . . .	1
II. ANGLICAN CONSERVATISM . . .	39
III. ANGLICAN PROGRESSIVENESS . . .	67
IV. The Principle of Orders . . .	91
V. The Achievements and Failures of Prot- estantism . . .	127
VI. The Unity of the Church . . .	167

PRINCIPLES OF ANGLICANISM

- I. The English Reformation.
- II. Anglican Conservatism.
- III. Anglican Progressiveness.

I

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

IT is the purpose of these lectures to comment upon the history of the Reformation in England in order to indicate the chief principles of belief and action, which have determined the policy of that portion of the Christian world which is in communion with the Church of England. The title, *Principles of Anglicanism*, is not wholly satisfactory. *Anglicanism* suggests what is limited and local, whereas the principles discussed are as broad as Christianity itself, and further what is exclusively English, whereas our especial concern is with what is American. But there seems to be no more available term to indicate that form of Christianity existing in what is called the Anglican Communion, wherein the same principles are given expression in slightly varying ways in the English, the British Colonial, and the American Churches, of which the Anglican Communion is composed. The history and life of all these is devoid of significance, if they be not regarded as stages in the evolution of a broader and deeper Christianity than they have as yet exhibited. The Book of Common Prayer contains a definite ideal of Christianity, which embodies principles susceptible of wider application than was given them at the time, and in the place, of their emergence, or than is now given them in their pres-

ent sphere of operation. This ideal was formed in a time of testing and experiment. Certain features of its history belong to the age of their occurrence and the place of their origin; yet the principles expressed may be distinguished from the accidents of their historical expression, and may be shown to have greater possible power for the future than they have had actual power in the past. These principles are professed by the American Episcopal Church, in which they are wholly independent of local and historical accidents, which condition their application in England; in which, also, they must stand or fall according to intrinsic value, since they have no accidental advantages of position to give prestige or special influence.¹

Any consideration of Church principles ought to make us both resolute and humble. It ought to stimulate loyalty and determination to put principles into fuller practice; and it ought to leave us with so sincere a sense of shortcoming as to make

¹ It is not conclusive for us to be able to say of this doctrine or of that practice that it is English. Nor, for that matter, is it conclusive for us to be able to say that it is American, although that is a consideration which for us has greater weight. There are many things which our brethren in England accept because they are English, believing apparently more in the Church of England because she is *of England* than because she is the *Church*; which we, if we accept them at all, accept because they satisfy the requirements of some different standard. Many Americans are of English descent, with Anglo-Saxon or at least Teutonic, presuppositions and tastes. But the majority of Americans are of different, or of mixed, racial antecedents; and the American race of the future will not be either purely, or even predominately, English or even Teutonic. Even if the English

it impossible ever to maintain those principles in any other spirit than that of charity. The duty of tolerance does not imply the absence of strong convictions; on the contrary, the truest and strongest tolerance springs out of strong convictions. There is an indifference due to both moral and mental flabbiness which calls itself tolerance and charity; but it has nothing in common with those virtues. Charity and tolerance can say what they believe, and why they believe it; and out of their devotion to truth, as they apprehend it, be able to understand the equal devotion to truth in those who apprehend it differently. The study of history helps us to see that the differences in belief and practice between good Christians represent not so much difference in motive or character as difference in the many sides of the one truth of which each and all have some partial apprehension. We may differ in opinion without breach of charity, when we appreciate that difference in apprehension means that each has something special to give and something special to gain, and

language, with all its wealth of historic and literary association, continue to be the language of Americans, it does not follow that England will be a mother-country, in the sense that we shall assume that anything attested by English experience will, as a matter of course, be equally useful in America. Our future relations with England are not likely to differ essentially from our relations with any other European country. It follows, therefore, that, if we continue to believe that the Protestant Episcopal Church has any special mission for the building up of Christianity in America, we shall accept it, not merely because it is an offshoot of the national Church of England, but because, for wholly independent reasons, we believe that it truly presents the Christian religion.

that out of the difference may come fuller apprehension of the whole content of truth tending to fuller mutual edification.

If we are to hold our own, and make our way, in the religious world of the future, it is necessary for us to translate our theology into intelligible terms of life, and our apologetic into terms of winning charity. There is at this time in the Church and outside it a wholesome impatience with any tone of anger or arrogance in the discussion of religious questions. It makes no difference how obvious the truth, nor how close to the sympathies of the hearer; if the truth be uttered with any suggestion of unkindness, the mode of utterance rouses prejudice against the truth itself. The day of polemics is past. That is, the polemical tone injures only him who adopts it, and the cause in behalf of which he uses it. If our apologetic is to have any effect, it must differ from the apologetic of the past in greater regard for the precept, "Speak the truth in love." Much truth has been spoken in anger or in scorn; but that method must give way to a better. In our arguments with those who differ, our most effective method of attack is not to score their faults but to recognise their virtues.

It is the object of these papers, first, to sketch the whole history of the English Reformation for the purpose of indicating those salient features which give distinctive character to Anglican Christianity; second, to consider Anglicanism on the side of its conservatism; and, third, on the side of its progressiveness.

It would be futile to attempt to sketch the history of the English Reformation in rose-colour. No period of history can be sketched in rose-colour with any degree of truthfulness. The English Reformation constitutes a perplexing and unedifying chapter in history; but, like many perplexing and unedifying chapters, it had an intelligible, and on the whole satisfactory, conclusion. With the tangle of intrigue and sordid politics, of which it was largely composed, were mingled threads of a different fibre; and the religious pattern ultimately woven on an unpromising woof reproduced something not wholly unlike that of the Church of the first days. On the surface of the history at the outset, there seemed nothing but a struggle between King Henry VIII and Pope Clement VII. The change in the Church seemed little more than the abolition of Papal Supremacy to make way for Royal Supremacy, more objectionable still. But below the surface lay something deeper and more important, which ultimately came plainly into view, and furnished a religious and ecclesiastical pattern widely copied as the years rolled by.

There have been many perplexing and unedifying chapters in the history of the Church, the true character of which appears not in the incidents of their occurrence, but in their ultimate results. The history of Martin Luther and the movement he inaugurated is far from attractive in most of its actual features. Yet there is no question that Luther was the great man of his century, and that his influence was on the whole for the benefit of the world. Similarly, the

history of the Council of Trent is troubled and repellent; yet its result was a strengthening of the Papal Church along many lines, and the inauguration of most of the better developments in modern Roman Catholicism. The history of the great councils in the fourth and fifth centuries is a tissue of turmoils; yet those councils actually served their ostensible purpose of defending the faith of the Gospel. Even the history of the age of the Apostles themselves is not edifying. The earliest Christians did not always love one another. The New Testament itself discloses a state of affairs in the first century as little attractive as that which existed in the sixteenth century, or as that which exists in the twentieth. Yet some of our greatest blessings come as direct results of disagreeable controversy. The struggles of the first age gave us the New Testament; the squabbles of the conciliar period, the Creeds; the quarrel between England and the Papacy, the Prayer Book. It is the Prayer Book which enshrines the spirit of Anglicanism; and Anglicanism is only justified, if its Book of Common Prayer does, as it claims, conform closely in its principles and in its injunctions to the pattern of primitive Christianity.

“History makes men wise”: that is, it gives that practical wisdom which comes of accumulated experience. The study of it, if properly pursued, will give a devotion to truth, and a desire for habits of accuracy of the same sort which results from the study of the natural sciences; it will give also increased measures of patience, fairness, and sympa-

thy, without which as presuppositions the study itself is impossible, and without which as results it has failed of its proper aim. The historical temper is, in its intellectual aspect, painstaking and truth-loving; in its moral aspect, long-suffering, just, and very human. Any investigation into the history of the Church will show how the treasures of truth and grace have been committed to earthen, very earthen, vessels; but will encourage by showing what use God has made of our fathers and brethren in the past, suggesting thereby the use He may make of us in present and in future.

1

The name Reformation is vaguely used to define that intellectual and social revolution in Western Europe during the fifteenth and two following centuries, by which the Christian Church was inevitably affected, and which marked the beginning of modern Christianity. To speak of *the* Reformation is misleading, in so far as the term fails to distinguish between distinct and differing lines of development, and also in its suggestion that change was always for the better. In most periods of upheaval and readjustment, the net result is gain, and the line of direction, as appears in retrospect, one of progress; yet every process of this sort is painful, and it may involve positive losses. Every period of transition in the world's history has been marked by scars of conflict; and much of the world's advance is painful progress by stumbles. So in the Reformation period, there was no sudden emergence from

darkness to light, no abrupt supersession of bad by good or of good by better. There was, however, the beginning of the age in which we live, in which the disintegration of feudalism made way for the spirit of democracy, and in which the principles of Christianity were adapted to the needs of the modern world. There was a re-formation of everything which constituted the life of mediæval Europe, of things social, things political, and things ecclesiastical. The reformation in the Church—which was not always reform—was only one aspect of a general readjustment.

The cause of change, generally speaking, was the discovery that the old system of things had outgrown its usefulness, since conceptions of the world and life had broadened and deepened; and it had become clear that for the future social laws and intellectual conceptions, more or less current for a thousand years, could no longer be regarded as satisfactory. It is impossible wholly to separate the religious change from the changes social and political, or to understand the religious movements in all their bearings, without reference to the general context; yet, for purposes of comparison, it is possible sufficiently to detach the religious elements in the change, to relate them to the religious history of the ages which preceded, and the age which followed.

In all Western Europe there was religious change, although the change was not everywhere uniform. It is more accurate to speak of four Reformations than of one, since from the beginning of the period

the religious change followed at least four distinct lines. There was a German Reformation, a Swiss Reformation, a Latin Reformation, and an English Reformation. No two followed identical lines; nor were any two in many respects similar. Yet all were characteristic products of the same age, and due to similar or identical influences. Martin Luther, John Calvin, Thomas Cranmer, and Ignatius Loyola were all reformers; yet no one of them had much toleration for any of the other three. It has been left for our generation to discover how much Calvin and Cranmer, Luther and Loyola, respectively, had in common; to see that Calvin's insistence on Christian Democracy was closely akin to Cranmer's defence of Royal Supremacy; and that Luther's method of teaching "Justification by faith only" was closely akin to the Jesuit doctrine that "the end justifies the means." It is interesting to study historical parallels in the operations of the spirit of any age; and it is possible to see how much in common there was between the different manifestations of Reformation spirit; but our special concern is with its operation in England, where there was evolved a form of modern Christianity adopted by ourselves as best adapted in our judgment to perpetuate the Christianity of the first age in our own country.

The English Reformation was not an event, but a period of transition. During the century and a half which elapsed between the accession of Henry VIII and the accession of Charles II, the national Church of England underwent a series of changes which gradually transformed her from one of the

family of western churches obedient to the See of Rome, having all the characteristic marks of Latin Christianity, into the Church of England as she is to-day. From the beginning of the period to the end, the history is that of a society rather than, as in the contemporary reform movements in Germany and Switzerland, the history of great leaders gradually gaining adherents. Only by degrees does this society work out its relation to other forms of organised Christianity; and only by degrees also does it become clearly conscious of those principles which from the first had determined its instinctive action. Life invariably precedes reflection, and experience of living, theories concerning it. There is nothing abnormal in the fact that the Church of England should have been advancing some time by a series of painful experiments before she produced the first of those theologians who interpreted to her the meaning of her own life.

In this period of transition, 1509-1660, there are to be distinguished two main stages, which indicate clearly the typical line of Anglican development: (1) the struggle with the Church of Rome, by which it became clear that the English Church had definitely abandoned much that was characteristic of mediæval institutions; and (2) the struggle with the system of Geneva, by which it became clear that she refused to adopt a radically revolutionary programme. Points of contact and of sympathy England had with both Rome and Geneva; but she refused to accept the domination of either. Yet, while repudiating what she held to be errors on both sides,

she endeavoured to reconcile fundamental conceptions of both. It is possible so to define the Anglican position of *via media* as to make it seem a timid avoidance of error, standing for nothing definite and positive, a shrinking from possible danger on the right and on the left, which leaves little solid ground to stand on. It is better understood as a deliberate occupancy of a central position, in itself safe and stable, and offering peculiar advantages of reconciling and combining the positive principles of those who flank its position on both sides. The characteristic answer of Anglican compromise when confronted by a question of dilemma, "Which will you choose, this side or that side?" is, "Both!" There would be little sense or credit in a Church's seeking to justify itself by saying, "I am not Rome; I am not Geneva; I am not associated with the peculiarities of those on this side of me, nor with the errors of those others on that," unless it can go on to say positively what it *is*. There is reason for confidence in a Church, if it can say with truth, "While identified with no one-sided position, with extremes represented by those on my right and on my left, I claim share in the fundamental truths, which account for the power of each, and strive to hold both sides of the truth in balance." The clue to the meaning of Anglicanism is to be found in the theory not that it avoids twofold error, but that it seeks combination of twofold truth.

1. It is possible to distinguish at least three causes which contributed to the religious changes in England during the reigns of the Tudors and the Stuarts.

First and most important was the enlarged conception of the world and life, which necessitated the abandonment of formulæ and institutions, which, however useful in the past, had ceased to be adequate. The feudal and scholastic age had come to an end, and a new era demanded something for itself. In the English Church this spirit of youthfulness is represented by the men of the New Learning—Erasmus, John Colet, Sir Thomas More. These men would have tested all doctrines and institutions of the Church by measurement with New Testament standards; and, as representing a new Christian age, strove for religious satisfaction by reversion to the oldest age of all. The new was desirous of superseding the old by something that was older still. In England as elsewhere in Europe arose a generation of men keen for the restoration of the Church to the principles of the earliest and purest days. Years before the King of England had any personal quarrel with the Pope, a school of Churchmen, favoured by those in authority, had been trained, who were striving to revive the fresh spirit of primitive Christian days; and who had in various ways anticipated the characteristic positions of the later English Prayer Book.

A second cause of change was the rapid rise to power and social importance of the so-called middle classes of society, the commercial classes, merchants and tradesmen, as distinguished from both the gentry and labourers. On the religious side, they were those who had been deeply affected by the spirit of Lollardy. The Lollard tradition, dating from John

Wycliffe, was stronger in England in the reign of Henry VIII than is sometimes recognised. It stood for various things, some good and some bad, but for none more plainly and effectively than for devotion to Holy Scripture. English reverence for the Bible is due chiefly to Wycliffe, whose influence has extended from the fourteenth century to our own. The demand for an English Bible and the satisfaction of that demand by the authorised translations of Tudor and Stuart times were due chiefly to Lollard influence, which operated strongly to fashion the religious character of the middle classes in society. This popular devotion to Scripture counted for much in paving the way for the products of the scholarly and devout researches of the men of the New Learning. In the commercial classes also was a certain restiveness at the suggestion of anything mystical in religion, and later also a disposition to oppose anything like hereditary authority, which led to the disparagement of the Church's sacramental teaching and assertion of authority, and to negative tendencies which ultimately worked themselves out in the form of English Puritanism.

These causes, silently changing the disposition of the people to regard all existing institutions as infallible, made possible the national revolt brought about by the third cause, or more strictly speaking the occasion, of the breach between the Church of England and Rome, the personal quarrel between King Henry VIII and Pope Clement VII. So far as this personal quarrel can be related to any underlying movement in society, worthy of being ranked

with the other causes of change, it must be connected with the growing spirit of nationalism. The great secret of Tudor influence was its ability to make aggressive sovereigns appear as champions of national right. No sovereigns were ever more selfish and tyrannical than Henry VIII and his daughter Elizabeth; yet both were able to make their subjects feel that the interests of the nation were identified with their own personal aggrandisement. Masterful as they were, they could never have gained their ends, and have maintained, as they did, an unrivalled popularity, had it not been for the popular conviction that Bluff King Hal and Good Queen Bess were devoted heart and soul to the interests of the English people.

The facts in the famous "King's Matter" were briefly these: Henry VIII had by special dispensation from Pope Julius II contracted a marriage forbidden by canon-law. As he had no son to succeed him, at a time when assurance as to the succession was a matter of grave importance, and when the heir-presumptive to the crown belonged to a nation which was England's traditional enemy, he seems to have felt an honest scruple, shared by others in his kingdom, that this failure of an heir indicated the judgment of God upon an unlawful marriage. This scruple, whatever its original character, assumed formidable proportions when—to use a Shakespearian phrase—"his conscience had sat too near another lady." Determined to have his marriage with his brother's widow declared null and void, Henry applied to the reigning pontiff, Clement VII, for a

bull to this effect, knowing that papal bulls had been provided in similar cases before. Clement wished to gratify him, and expressed himself to this effect; but he shrank from incurring the displeasure of the imperial nephew of Henry's queen, and shrank also in the interests of papal prestige from nullifying the action of one of his most recent predecessors. Negotiations were protracted, until at last Henry in his impatience had the matter settled independently of the Pope and his Curia.

An obscure ecclesiastical lawyer, Thomas Cranmer, was the first to suggest that the way to deal with the matter was to assert the independence of the national courts. This was the sole question of principle raised by Henry's quarrel with Clement; but it had far-reaching consequences. Henry claimed that in such matters as marriage the ecclesiastical courts of his own kingdom were competent to act without reference to Rome or any foreign tribunal. When the national court pronounced sentence in his favour, the decision was generally accepted in England as final, in spite of popular sympathy with the discarded queen. But there had been a declaration of independence of the Papacy in one particular, and this was to lead to denial of other forms of the exercise of papal authority in England. Most important of all, it set the followers of the New Learning to investigating and criticising the basis of papal claims and of the whole Church system. The Papacy was tested by the New Testament and by the history of the early Church. The actual rise of the papal power, as the ecclesiastical embodiment in feudal form of the spirit

of imperial Rome, was indicated by a series of acute critics. The result of this scrutiny of papal claims, in the light of Scripture and history, was the general conviction that the King was right in asserting that "the Bishop of Rome hath no more authority in this realm than any other foreign Bishop." National feeling supported the King. Men of all types acquiesced in this repudiation of papal jurisdiction, even those who later opposed change seeming at first quite reconciled to the action which had been taken.

The actual question raised by this discussion of "the King's Matter" was whether the Archbishop of Canterbury's court was not independent in a certain respect of the Pope. The criticism which resulted from the raising of this question led to a readjustment of all existing ecclesiastical institutions. The nature of this criticism in raising new standards, or in restoring old standards, of authority is the significant fact in the whole incident. The chief importance of the royal rebellion against the Pope was that it afforded an opportunity for the free play for the spirit of the New Learning. Henry overthrew the papal tyranny not in the interests of fuller liberty for the Church, but that he might establish a royal tyranny in its place. In matters of discipline he acted as his own Pope, and by various arbitrary acts he oppressed the Church. His most flagrant tyranny was his suppression of the English monasteries. Under cover of zeal for reformation he inaugurated a system of unscrupulous plunder, his schemes of further plunder of schools and

universities being only thwarted by his timely death.

The Church of England was subservient to the King in his assertion of national independence, and feared openly to oppose his schemes; but there is abundant evidence that the mind of the Church was working in independence of, and in advance of, the mind of its royal master. The Church of England as represented by its ecclesiastical leaders was ready for restatement of doctrine, for revision of liturgies, and for suppression of some superstitious abuses. This appears plainly in the so-called "Ten Articles" and in the explanation of them given in "the Bishops' Book." The Bible was translated into English, and the materials for the Prayer Book were collected. But, except for the use of English in Lessons and Litany, King Henry would have none of these things. In the end of his reign he checked movements toward reform and asserted and enforced subscription to the special articles of current Latin theology. So far is it from being true that Henry VIII founded the Church of England, or even that he inaugurated the Church of England's present system, that it was he who prevented the assertion of principles typically Anglican by the authorities of the Church, who were ready to act. It was necessary for the Bishops to bide their time until after his death. The situation at the end of Henry's reign has been pithily expressed by Dr. Gairdner, "It was the old religion with the Pope left out." (To be quite accurate, add, "and the monks.")

2. Restatements of doctrine and changes in prac-

tice were to come later, but only by slow degrees. For almost forty years it was doubtful whether England might not return to the papal obedience; but the final issue, reached after much perplexity and experiment, was that "there can be no union with Rome, until Rome be other than she is." Under the boy-king, Edward VI, it became possible for the Church authorities to take action which had been checked by King Henry; and there was a new question demanding speedy settlement. It was necessary to decide not only whether the Church of England should adopt such changes as were suggested by the criticism of the men of the New Learning in England, but also whether, if she broke with the system of Rome, she would align herself with the revolting bodies on the continent of Europe, either in Germany or in Switzerland. This question was inevitable in logic, and it was rendered pressing by politics. It quickly took the definite form, How far will the English Church follow Calvin? The only form of Continental Protestantism which made any deep impression in England was the Swiss. The Pope of Rome had been dethroned, and the Pope of Geneva was more than ready to take his place. For over a century determined effort was made to supersede the Anglican by the Genevan system.

The history of the English Church during the reign of Edward VI has two distinct aspects and follows two distinct lines. The English Convocation, composed of the higher clergy of the realm, continued such plans of reform as had been outlined in the previous reign, giving further illustration of the

spirit of the New Learning. The English Privy Council imported and favoured ideas of a new sort, and gave a new and startling exhibition of the possible effects upon the Church of the doctrine of Royal Supremacy. The Convocation and Privy Council pursued their respective courses with little reference to each other; and the Convocation, ignored in its official capacity by those in authority, seems not to have taken strictly formal action in regard to what was unmistakably its own characteristic work. But even if formal sanction were lacking, the higher clergy did give tacit consent to the acts of the leading Bishops, who represented the highest intelligence in the Church of their generation.

The chief acts of the Church, as represented by its natural leaders, consisted in the completion of the alterations of doctrinal and devotional formularies which had been previously planned. In the year of Henry's death, 1547, order was issued that the Epistles and Gospels should be read in English from the version of the Bible published under the auspices of Cranmer. In the following year, it was ordered that the whole of the Order of the Communion should be rendered in English instead of in Latin, and that the Eucharist should be administered to the laity in both kinds. In 1549 appeared the First Book of Common Prayer, an expurgated and condensed English version of the Use of Salisbury. At the same time the clergy were permitted to marry; and forty-five Articles of Religion were drawn up by Archbishop Cranmer to define the position of the English Church upon certain mooted points. These

Articles were later reduced to forty-two, and still later to the familiar thirty-nine.

The English Prayer Book was displeasing to Calvinists, by whose influence after three years it was superseded by a revision. This Second Prayer Book was in theory in use for eleven months, and was destined by those who favoured it to make way for a further revision more in accord with the teachings of Geneva. This plan was never carried to completion, the existing English Prayer Book being the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, altered in some ways to make it more in accord with the First. This First Prayer Book must be taken as the chief evidence of what was in the minds of leading English Churchmen in the first half of the sixteenth century. It indicated a determination to revise the Church system in accordance with first principles, without sacrifice of anything which could claim sanction of the Church's earliest days. A revision of canon-law was also planned; and a "visitation" was undertaken by the Archbishop with the special object of enforcing preaching and of suppressing superstition. On the whole, this was well carried out.

The Privy Council were concerned, however, not with liturgical revision, but with schemes of plunder. They needed money, and they wished to continue the lucrative depredations of the late King. They assumed supremacy over the Church as acting for the Crown and sought to impose their will directly on the people. They knew that Henry had spoiled the monasteries and monastic churches of property worth more than fifty million pounds, and that hav-

ing squandered this he had turned his eyes toward the other churches and the institutions of learning. They proceeded to carry out the policy formulated in the mind of their late master by confiscating all property belonging to colleges, free chapels, chantries, guilds, and brotherhoods, assigning as reason that these properties, especially the endowments of chantries, were used for purposes of "superstition." They urged that the property could better be used for schools, universities, and the poor. No schools or poor ever saw any of that money. Six grammar schools, it is true, were started afresh with a small portion of their original endowment; but this is the sole basis for the popular delusion that Edward VI was a special patron of learning. These endowments having been seized, the next attack was upon "ornaments," church-decorations, and church-plate, to justify which there was a great outcry against "idolatry." Images of all kinds were ruthlessly destroyed, the only exception made being in favour of "any king, prince, nobleman, or other dead person, which hath not been commonly reputed or taken for a saint." The graven saints were expelled and the graven sinners left in possession. The churches were stripped bare of plate, hangings, vestments, carving, and glass; and all who opposed the destruction were exposed to bitter persecution. Five of the older Bishops, who refused to connive at the plunder, were imprisoned upon trivial pretexts. In 1550 the universities were subjected to a ruinous "visitation," and their libraries were gutted. There was a special outcry against the "superstition" of

the scholastic theologians. Books and manuscripts were carried off by the cart-load, sold to tradesmen for fuel, and sent by shipfuls to foreign book-binders.

To give colour to this pillage it was necessary for the Privy Council to encourage any influence which would seem to excuse their action to the popular conscience. Henry had been able to suppress the monasteries, because there was a settled, sober conviction that the monasteries had outlived their usefulness, and that it was better for society that their extensive property should pass into other hands. Edward VI's Privy Council had to educate public opinion toward similar convictions in regard to chantry endowments and church-plate. They found instruments to their hand in the Swiss iconoclasts. Zwingli had raised a war-cry against "idols"; and the pet bug-bears of Swiss Reform were "idolatry" and "superstition." The Dukes of Somerset and Northumberland, therefore, found that it suited their purposes to encourage fanatical exponents of this side of the Swiss teaching, and to favour in every possible way agitators whose anti-ecclesiastical tirades seemed to give excuse to their spoliations. They found no party disposed to such extreme views; they created one. They encouraged foreign teachers of the stamp they found useful; they promoted to high posts men holding views of this sort, and by this policy they introduced an element of violent fanaticism into the English Church which has never been wholly lost. Puritanism in its negative and destructive aspect is a legacy of the reign of Edward VI.

Dr. Hort describes the history of the English Church between 1534 and 1662 as a series of "experiments in Anglicanism." Under Edward VI, two were tried: (1) the one begun under Henry, of revised forms of worship in English, and (2) the new one, of borrowing ideas and practices from Zurich and Geneva. The services of the First Prayer Book in the old churches were fairly popular; those of the Second Prayer Book in the shamefully defaced churches were not. The net result of all the events of the reign was to make the people disgusted with the policy of the Privy Council. Under Henry VIII it had become clear that change was necessary; under Edward VI it had been suggested that the change be after the model of Geneva. The popular answer to this was, "No." The tendency of opinion appeared plainly in the fact that the most popular person in the kingdom was the Princess Mary, who refused to accept any changes whatsoever and was ready to die for the old religion. England applauded her spirit; and at her brother's death she came to the throne with an acclaim of popular welcome such as has been given to no subsequent English sovereign.

3. The reign of Queen Mary was not, as appears on the surface, the undoing of the English Reformation, but constitutes an important stage in its establishment. A new experiment was tried. If it was represented that "reform" meant the gloomy and destructive programme of the agents of Edward's Privy Council, the question was inevitably raised, "Is it not better to go back to the old system alto-

gether?" That was Mary's conscientious and bigoted conviction; and that was the suspicion, if not conviction, of a great number of her subjects. At any rate the experiment was tried, with the result that no period in the Reformation history did more to convince Englishmen that for them the religious system of the Roman Church was absolutely impossible than this interval of five years during which the papal authority and system seemed to be triumphantly restored. The system of the Latin Church was presented in its most foreign form. A Spanish King and an Italianised Archbishop, together with the imported methods of the Inquisition, were not effective missionaries for an already discredited faith. The revulsion from recent experiences and the early popularity of the Queen made it fairly easy to bring about a formal reconciliation of the kingdom to the Papal See; but the feeling was shortlived. By contrast with the Latin rites now restored, the Prayer Book services seemed vitally effective; and when the reign of terror began, and the Prayer Book had its martyrs in Oxford and Smithfield, the doom of the papal religion was sealed. The net result of Mary's experiment was to deepen the conviction that the old religion had lost its power to rule or to attract the England of the new era; and the sovereign who had sought its restoration was handed down to history as the "bloody" Queen.

4. At the accession of Queen Elizabeth popular sentiment was in favour of an English service and an English freedom for an English Church. Elizabeth's popularity—not so great as her sister's to

begin with, but increasing to a degree that has had no parallel—was due chiefly to her ability to make her people feel that she was an entirely English sovereign. She had unlimited courage, shrewd sense, and a woman's tact. She had little principle and probably little genuine regard for religious interests; but her influence was used, and used successfully, to establish the system of the English Prayer Book. In this she was doubtless carrying out the wishes of a great majority of her subjects, whose religious genius and capacity she rightly interpreted. In her reign the question of the relation of the national Church to the Roman See was finally settled. Theoretically settled it had been before; but it was not clear that the character and attitude of the Roman Church might not be changed by the reforms expected at Trent; nor wholly clear whether England's political interests would permit her to hold aloof from the dominant religion in Europe. The final breach with Rome came in 1571, when the papal power was clearly arrayed against the English nation. A crusade was proclaimed against England, and men had to choose between the Pope and the Queen. National spirit was aroused in defence of what had now come to be regarded as the national religion, and there came settled conviction that the breach could never be healed.

It was during Elizabeth's reign that the first stage of the English Reformation came to an end, and before proceeding to speak of events belonging to the second stage, which occurred during the same period, it may be well to seek the central thought and pre-

vailing principle which determined the issue of this first controversy. It is most easy to do this by reference to representative men of the period. If it is necessary to select one man, who best personifies the spirit of this first stage of the English Reformation, there is no question as to who that one must be. Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury under Henry and Edward, is both by position and by character the representative of his time. He is not heroic nor a masterful leader; but neither was the Church he served distinguished in his day for heroism or leadership. He is singularly disappointing in many ways; so is the Church of his day. But there are three ways of looking at Cranmer, in which his whole life may be regarded as typical. First, in his impressionability. He lived in a time of seething unrest, when many ideas were in the air, and many forces contending for dominance. His very timidity of natural disposition and readiness to yield to a stronger will made it easy for him to absorb something of every influence and force to which he was exposed in such a way as to make him a representative man in his unusually wide receptiveness. Lacking in character for leadership, he was yet able to be an effective leader by the wisdom which came from his wide and well-utilised experience. In a period of unrest, he was able to learn something from every quarter; and in breadth of intelligence and variety of feeling he was able to make up for what he lacked in strength of will. He can never be ranked as a man of first class in character; he was unmistakably a man of first class in influence. Sec-

ondly, he is typical man of his time in his determination that the truths of Christianity should be brought home to men in their own tongue. To Cranmer chiefly do we owe both our English Bible and our Prayer Book. Their moving, musical, and majestic English constitute his imperishable monument. So long as we reverence the truths they teach, and have wit to admire their inimitable excellence of form, so long must we revere his pathetic memory. Thirdly, he is typical man of the Bible and Prayer Book period as its most conspicuous martyr. His efforts to save his life by recantation were pitiful; but at last he died bravely. His waverings in opinion, as he was swayed by this influence or that, are confusing and disappointing; but he ended by professing his loyalty to the principles of the Prayer Book which he had chief share in shaping. He was condemned for heresy, which involved three items, all of which meant the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer; first, concerning "ceremonies of the Church," which meant preference for English over Latin rites; second, concerning papal supremacy, the rightfulness of which he denied; third, heresy concerning the presence of our Lord's Body in the Eucharist. He rejected scholastic definitions for the simpler statements of Scripture. He did not deny the genuine giving of something spiritual; but he preferred to speak of this in language similar to that of our Articles and Catechism. "The true body of Christ," he said, "is present to those who truly receive Him. . . . Inwardly we eat Christ's Body; outwardly we eat the sacrament. Yet the

Body of Christ is in the sacrament both by substance and by efficacy." When for these beliefs he was first degraded, and then burned, by the representatives of the Pope and Queen Mary, we must recognise that here was one who sealed by death the teaching of his life, and in death as well as in life was loyal to that form of Christianity which we ourselves accept as faithfully representing the teaching of our Lord.

As indicating the basal principle whereby the Church of England justified itself for its attitude toward the Latin Communion and for the system which it adopted for itself, reference may be made to two of the first generation who were trained by the Prayer Book and became prominent during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The first is John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, who published in 1562 an *Apology for the Church of England*, which was the first formal defence of Anglicanism as a system. In this he elaborates a famous challenge he had made several years before in a sermon at Paul's Cross. Jewel's principle is simply this, that nothing can be regarded as essential to Catholic Christianity which did not exist in the primitive Church. We can accept no criterion of Catholicity which would rule out the primitive fathers and the Apostles. That principle determined the beliefs of the Anglican reformers and was the touchstone of their practice in the work of revision. It would be futile to maintain that they had such perfect knowledge as to be able to apply the principle with invariable accuracy; but as a principle decisive in regard to doctrine, rite,

and government, this rule goes farther than any other to explain the constitution and teaching of the Church of England and our own.

It is this principle which lies at the bottom of the teaching of one of the wisest of the Reformation Archbishops, Matthew Parker. In a letter to one of the Marian Bishops, who refused to accept the restored Prayer Book, and remained loyal to the Pope, he wrote, with a touch of controversial bitterness which is unusual in one of so sympathetic a character as his: "We yield more subjection unto Christ and His Apostles than ye fathers of the Romish tribe do; for we honour and adore Christ as the true Son of God, equal with His Father as well in authority as in majesty, and do make Him no foreigner to the realm, as you members and clergy of the Church of Rome do; but we profess Him to be our only Maker and Redeemer, and Ruler of His Church, not only in this realm, but also in all nations, unto Whom princes and preachers are but servants; the preachers to propose, and the princes to execute, Christ's will and commandment, Whom you and all that desire to be saved must believe and obey, against all councils and tribunals who do dissent from His word, whether regal or papal." "The Apostles we reverence and obey, as the messengers from Christ, and do receive their writings with exacter obedience than Romanists do; for we will not permit, as Rome and her clergy do, any to dispense against the Scriptures. . . . We confess the Apostles were men allowed of God, to whom the Gospel should be committed, and therefore we receive

the Word from them, not as the word of man, but as it is truly the Word of God; assuring ourselves it is God's power to save all who believe. Thus doth our Reformation detest your Romish errors and heinous presumptions, which makes your Romish writers and Popes to add, alter, and diminish, nay also to dispense with the words which Christ Himself spake, as well as the writings of the Apostles." "We have imitated the [African] fathers by our Reformation and denying of unlawful demands. . . . Ye, through your perverseness, have separated yourselves not only from us, but from these ancient fathers and their opinions."¹ "I answered [to some French] that I would wish them to come nigher to us, *grounding ourselves, as we do, upon the apostolical doctrine and pure time of the primitive Church.*"² No words could express better than these last the aim and belief of those who gave us our Prayer Book and our Bible.

2

1. The second stage of the English Reformation overlaps the first, and may be dated roughly from 1549 to 1662. During this the Church of England became more clearly conscious of its principles and developed its strength in new ways in its efforts to determine its relations to the religious system of John Calvin. Its first acquaintance with Swiss influence had been in the reign of Edward VI, when

¹ Letter to Archbishop Heath of March 26, 1560. *Parker's Works*, pp. 110, 112.

² Letter to Sir William Cecil, 1564. *Parker's Works*, p. 216.

iconoclastic ideas, Zwinglian rather than Calvinist, had been fostered for obvious motives by the Privy Council. But the overthrow of this faction did not mean the elimination of Swiss influence. In the reign of Elizabeth, England was to learn more of the stronger and nobler types of Calvin's followers. It is possible to distinguish at least three classes of Puritans—to use the common name for English Calvinists—the iconoclastic type, destructive, purely negative, repellent; the mystical type, showing many beautiful traits of Christian character, but usually erratic if not fanatical; and the moderate type, which constituted the bulk of the party in England, noted for its sober, resolute righteousness. There were various elements in English society, which were ready to welcome the Calvinistic teaching and temper. The Lollard influence assumed this form; the commercial classes welcomed a system which seemed to minimize the element of mystery in religion and in life; the exigencies of politics induced England to be on cordial terms with continental Protestants and Reformed. Some of Elizabeth's courtiers, notably the Earl of Leicester, wished to favour enemies of the Church's system for the same reason as Edward's Protectors.

For thirty years of Elizabeth's reign there seemed to be an irresistible tendency Genevaward; but by the end of her reign it had been made quite clear (1) that the Church of England had refused to abandon her heritage as an historic Church to become a new sect; (2) that she had succeeded in assimilating such elements of the Calvinist system as appeared in the

moderate Puritans; who, disgusted by the excesses of the fanatics of their party, were willing to throw in their lot with the Church; and (3) that by rigorous enforcement of conformity she had driven several sets of non-conformists from the country.

In the system of Calvin the Church of England found a rival with which she found it necessary to struggle for more than a hundred years. The strength of the Calvinist influence was not due merely to accidental considerations of politics or of selfish policy, but to the undoubted strength of the system itself. This appeared in its strong positive principles, teaching the fear of God and developing powerful wills; in the overpowering logic of its formal statement in the *Institutes* of Calvin, which for a long time was the only complete system of modern divinity easily available; in the convincing lives of earnest men, who were the moral superiors of many of the clergy in a worldly-minded Church. Then, too, Calvinists as a class were aggressive, masterful men. They admitted no compromise and were in the habit of having their way. In England their objections to the regulations of the Church had to do with comparative trifles, the sign of the Cross, wafer-bread, altars, surplices, clerical dress of any sort; but these things indicated a rooted aversion from the whole Church system and the sacramental teaching of the Prayer Book, and a determination on their part to fashion the English Church wholly after the Genevan model. As the radically destructive character of the Puritan demands appeared, two things happened. The Church became more

resolute to defend itself, and the moderate Puritans became reconciled to Anglican ways. The strength of Puritanism lay in its insistence on a personal relation between God and man and hatred of a professional religion. While intellectually it failed to demonstrate its right to destroy the polity and sacraments of the English Church, it did demonstrate that the English Church, if it were to survive, must make a home for its moral earnestness; and Anglican history has been deeply and beneficially affected by the assimilation of this element.

2. The question of the Anglican attitude toward Calvinism seemed to have been settled by the end of Elizabeth's reign; but Puritanism revived under the political conditions which grew up under the Stuarts. In the great contest between royal absolutism and the defence of popular rights by parliamentary authority, the Church of England allied itself to the falling cause of monarchy; and this alliance proved a millstone around its neck. It was weakened by identification with interests inimical to the nation; its foes became powerful more by the accidents of politics than by any new moral strength to their cause; and with the overthrow of the monarchy came the overthrow of the Church, and the setting up of a Calvinist establishment.

3. The triumph of Puritanism under the Commonwealth served in the second stage of the English Reformation a function analogous to that of the triumph of Romanism under Queen Mary in the first. The people were not sure but that they wanted this system after all. They got it; and they got enough

of it. The rule of Cromwell as effectually sealed the doom of Puritanism as the dominant religion for England as the rule of Bloody Mary sealed the doom of Romanism. Cromwell pled for tolerance; but his tolerance extended only to different species of Calvinists. Papists, Prelatists, Infidels, and Quakers had no share in his tender mercies. The Prayer Book was proscribed; its use became again an offence punishable by fine, imprisonment, and exile; some few met their deaths because of their devotion to it. But never had its influence been really greater, and never was the triumph of its principles over its enemies more assured than in the day of persecution.

4. The restoration of the monarchy saw the restoration of the Church, not only to a position of political importance, but also to a position of assured lodgment in the minds and affections of most of the English people. It was the Prayer Book and the Prayer Book only that the people wanted; and nothing could shake its authority. The most striking example of this appears from the fact that the later Stuarts, however unfriendly, could not change it. Two of them were Roman Catholics; but they could not dislodge the Prayer Book. The one who tried dislodged himself. One of them was a Calvinist and opposed to the Anglican system; but he could do nothing to supersede it. The weakest of all the Stuarts enjoyed comparatively great popularity and influence because of her supposed devotion to the Church's cause. Whatever its strength, or whatever its weakness, by the last quarter of the seventeenth century the position of the Anglican

Church system was assured as an important factor in the religious problems of the next two hundred years.

5. It is possible to illustrate this stage of the history as well as the former by reference to an apologist and an Archbishop. The special defender of the English Church against the Puritan attack was Richard Hooker, who more than any other one theologian has given to Anglicanism a tone and direction, which it has never lost. He tested the Puritan claims at the bar of Scripture, history, and common-sense, and refuted them; and by the same criteria strove to justify the Church, whose champion he had become. The special characteristics are what Mr. Gladstone calls "his massive reasoning," his studied moderation, whereby he strove to allow full weight to every opposing argument and to give place to every point of view differing from his own, and the majesty of his language, which has made his *Ecclesiastical Polity* an English, as well as an Anglican, classic. "Puritanism," writes Dr. S. R. Gardiner, "with its healthy faith and manly vigour long continued to supply the muscle and sinew of English religion; but its narrow severity has given way before the broader and gentler teaching of the disciples of Hooker and Andrews."¹

The Archbishop in the second stage who corresponds to Cranmer in the first is, of course, none other than Laud. The one was burned by Romanists, the other beheaded by Puritans, for one and

¹ Gardiner: *History of England*, II: 125.

the same reason, namely, devotion to the Book of Common Prayer. Neither had a character of winning attractiveness; and yet both command not only pity but respect. Cranmer was timid and yielding; Laud was nothing like that. He was a stiff, sturdy, little person, bustling about many affairs; "little meddling hocus-pocus" he was called; devoted to many sorts of good work, yet offending most by his brusque and testy manners, and living with apparently only one conviction, namely, that the human race was created for the sole purpose of obeying the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer. He aimed at nothing, and cared for nothing but the successful working of that ecclesiastical system with which we are ourselves identified; yet by his methods of insisting upon trifling points, his exalting of means above ends, his strict and petty legalism, and the roughness of his dealings with touchy people, he did more to disaffect those who were ready and desirous to be disaffected than any one man of his time. He himself was strictly obedient to law; and he demanded prompt and complete obedience from all others. He was a very conscientious, simple, humble, little soul, without a bit of bitterness or rancour; but the real beauty of his character, as it appears in his *Diary* and *Devotions*, was hidden by his bristling exterior; and the little man went to his death almost unappreciated even by those who were closest to him. He was declared a traitor; but the sum and substance of his offending was that he had undertaken to enforce the existing law of the Church. From this he was unwilling to subtract one jot or

one tittle; but the opposition to him was determined by opposition to the Church, of which he was chief minister. It was significant that the only twelve lords who could be collected to declare his attainder at the same time abolished the Prayer Book. Laud was exposed to much needless aggravation; but he stood the test of persecution well; and he made a simple, brave, and Christian end. These words from his will are characteristic: "I die, as I have lived, in the true orthodox profession of the Catholic Faith of Christ, foreshadowed by the prophets, and preached to the world by Christ Himself, His blessed Apostles and their successors; and a true member of His Catholic Church, within communion of a living part thereof, the present Church of England, *as it stands established by law.*"

In these words is a strong claim for the spiritual position of the Church of England; but it is coupled with a qualification indicative not only of the absence of a true sense of proportion in the mind of Laud, whom we cannot fail to reverence, when we know his devotion to that which has for us supreme value, but also of a special weakness in the Church of England's position. There has been too much stress laid on its being "established by law," too great a tendency to treat its legal and political establishment as paramount in importance to its hold on primitive principle. Erastianism has been the besetting sin, and is now the congenital weakness, of the English Church. State-support has made it possible for it to play its great part in the history of the nation and of the world; but on the other

hand, it has tended to lower the tone of the Church by obscuring its true character as a spiritual society.

If English Church history has one special lesson, and if there be one lesson which the Anglican Church has had the best of opportunities to learn, and ought to be in a position to teach, it is the lesson illustrated by that whole period, which has just been sketched, the duty of *balance by combination*. The characteristic Anglican virtue is, or ought to be, *balance*; its contribution to religious development ought to be the safeguarding of the whole of truth by the combination of opposing or partial truths, whose harmony is not at first apparent.

II

ANGLICAN CONSERVATISM

IF I were asked to name one man who seemed to me best to embody the spirit of the English Reformation in the Reformation period, I should go out of England to find him. I should say without hesitation that, on the whole, the best example of the principles and intention of the English Church was to be found in Desiderius Erasmus. Erasmus' actual connection with England was slight, although his influence was of sufficient weight to make it impossible ever to ignore it. But, apart from this, the Reformation in England followed lines, and was determined by a spirit, which belong to his special genius. Erasmus would have tested all Christian institutions by New Testament standards. He was one who strove to discriminate between the permanent and the transitory, between the essential and the accidental, and who strove to purify and to modify, though not to overthrow, the Church of his day by a return to the simpler standards of the first Christian age. His radical disbelief in the conventions of mediæval feudalism as being of essential importance to the Christian faith, distinguished him from the class of men who worked for reform at Trent; although he never renounced the communion

of the Latin Church. His suspicion of the radical departures from the structural principles of the historic Church, which he detected and deplored in Luther and Zwingli, distinguishes him clearly from the whole class of Continental reformers. He was solitary in his theories and beliefs. He had immense influence, but little of a following. There was never any body of Erasmians. But after his death the changes in England did follow very closely such lines as he had indicated as likely to lead to improvement; and it is easy to believe that, had he lived until a later date, he would have recognised his kinship to the typically Anglican trend of thought. In his lifetime he recognised the specially congenial character of his English pupils, whose influence counted for much in the training of two generations. Of all the forces making for change in England, the New Learning was the one which weighed most heavily; and Erasmus was the father of the New Learning in England.

There are always two sides and two aspects of Anglican development, a conservative and a progressive, the balance and interplay of which determine the character of Anglican history. From this constant and constitutional balance there are two main results: (1) the conservatism is not synonymous with antiquarianism or immobility; (2) the progress is always conditioned by the requirements of primitive law. There was a similar combination in Erasmus. As distinct from the contented upholders of things as they were, he was progressive; as distinguished from advocates of rash and radical

measures, he was signally conservative. As a result he did not wholly like anybody; and nobody wholly approved of him. In this again, his effort to preserve balance between extremes displeasing to partisans on either side, his history is not wholly unlike that of the Church with which it is here associated.

It is the purpose of this paper to consider the chief marks of Anglican Conservatism. The most obvious illustrations of this are to be found in the four points specified as the necessary conditions of Church Unity in the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral; Scriptures, Creeds, Sacraments, Ministry, proposed as a sort of fourfold foundation for a modern presentation of ancient Christianity. It may be asserted that the conservatism of the Anglican position appears first in its Authority, second in its Doctrine, third in its Mysticism, and fourth in its Government.

1. Our mother Church of England has always been distinguished by great devotion to Holy Scripture. In no part of Europe during the Reformation was there more consistent effort made to use Scripture as final authority. This was due to two lines of development, traceable respectively to Wycliffe and Erasmus. The Lollard devotion to the Bible was often more zealous than intelligent, and often associated with violent fanaticism. By itself it was more akin to Continental Protestantism than to English. Luther recognised his kinship to Wycliffe; and Lollardy pure and simple lost itself in the stream of English Calvinism. But Lollardy was responsible for the popular demand for Scriptural knowledge, which counted as one of the chief signs of religious

interest during the period. Lollardy was responsible for a popular craving; but it was the New Learning which was responsible for its scholarly and truly spiritual satisfaction. It was Erasmus, rather than Wycliffe, who stands at the head of the long line of Biblical scholars who have adorned the modern Church of England. Wycliffe is chiefly responsible for Tyndale, Coverdale, and Foxe; but Erasmus rather is the precursor of Cranmer, Parker, Andrewes, and Westcott. To him and his school may be traced that devotion to sound learning, and the devotion of sound learning to Scriptural study and criticism, which have formed one of the chief glories of the English Church. This learning embraced in its scope not only the original languages of the Scriptures, but also the whole field of Christian history; and this it was which determined the nature of the changes made in the Church's practice. Sound learning devoted to the study of the Christian title-deeds was ultimately responsible for the English Bible and Prayer Book.

This devotion to Scripture meant chiefly devotion to the New Testament. While the appeal to Scripture rather than to the Church, as represented in the Papacy, was characteristic of all the reformers, English reformers were distinguished from the great Continental leaders in their method of reference to the New Testament. They resembled Luther in referring to the New Testament rather than the Old, as distinct from Calvin, who, seeking for a code of detailed laws issued by the Sovereign of the universe, found most of what he sought in the Pentateuch.

The decrees of irresistible Jehovah, as more explicitly stated in the books of the Law than in the Gospels, seemed to lend themselves more readily to application in the society of Geneva. Calvin's predominant conception of God as Power, as well as his seeking for clearly defined laws, led him to make much use of the Old Testament Scriptures; and it is noticeable that Calvinism always creates an Old Testament atmosphere. In their preference for the New Testament Scriptures, both Lutherans and Anglicans are distinguished from Calvinists. But there are differences between them. Luther, seeking a theory of individual justification, which should correspond to his own religious experience, narrowly concentrated his attention upon certain chapters in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. He had comparatively scant regard for those portions of the Bible which did not seem to, or did not, teach justification by faith only in his own fashion. His use of Scripture was less varied than that of the fathers of the Prayer Book. Yet it cannot be claimed that in their use of Scripture Anglicans always displayed perfect sense of proportion. Perhaps a characteristic limitation would appear in a tendency to concentrate attention upon such details as appear in the Acts of the Apostles, somewhat more than upon Gospel facts and Epistle theology. Where the Latins would quote St. Thomas Aquinas or the Master of Sentences, and illustrate, if possible, from Scripture, where Calvin would quote Leviticus, or Luther Romans iii:28 (*cf.* iv:5), the Anglicans would quote the Acts. Their special virtue is that they set out

to fashion their practice after the primitive pattern; but it is a special limitation that they were often content with correct forms of practice without adequate regard to principles lying behind them.

Anglicanism can only be rightly understood by recognising how closely its spirit is intended to be that of the Acts. Its history is always that of a Church. Acting as a Church, it strove to conform to the Church of the earliest days. In spite of Henry VIII and his wives and Queen Elizabeth and her ministers, the recognition of this fact alone gives a theory which will explain the formation and use, and more than all the spirit, of the Book of Common Prayer. This was no new thing, merely a new version of old things; but it represented the effort to test the whole system of the Church by the touchstone of Scripture, not isolated but taken in its historical setting.

Yet this devotion to Scripture as ultimate evidence for the origins of the Christian Church did not degenerate into Bibliolatry. Christianity is the religion of a Person, not of a Book; and the function of the Book with reference to the Person was never lost sight of. The religion is the religion of a Person, perpetuated in a Society whose title-deeds are recorded in a Book. Book and Society are subordinate to the Person; and it is the Society that keeps and expounds the Book. The Book was not regarded as a miraculous accident unrelated to the historic Christian Society, but was dealt with in its context. It was recognised that the Church was author and custodian of the Christian Scriptures,

and that the Church in the age which produced them is the rightful interpreter of them. Reference to Scripture meant Scripture as interpreted by the early Church.

More important than this historical use of Scriptural authority is the first of Anglican presuppositions, the substantial accuracy of the New Testament narrative and implications. Belief in the Scriptures as ultimate authority for the Christian facts, and belief in them as in a unique sense a revelation from God, constitutes a fixed point of departure for Anglican development. As time goes on, views may change as to the meaning of details in portions of Scripture, and as to the meaning and method of inspiration; but there can be no change in the recognition of the Scriptures as in a special way the embodiment of truth revealed to men by God Himself. Anglicanism cannot break away from the Scriptures as authority for its beliefs and practices without ceasing to be itself.

2. If the reformed Church of England intended to be ultra-conservative in practice, and was essentially conservative in its recognition of authority, it was also conservative in doctrine. Apostolic practice was to go hand in hand with the faith of the Gospel. It held, and it holds, to the original doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son of God. If Scripture was to be interpreted historically with reference to Church institutions, it was also to be taken literally with reference to the central point in its teaching. This is indicated by the firm retention of the ancient Creeds.

In the sixteenth century there were few discussions concerning Theology proper. Popes and reformers alike held to the Theology of the Scriptures and Creeds; and Popes and Reformers alike burned for heresy those who denied the Divinity of Christ. Controversies raged about questions of authority and church-government, and about the nature and use of Sacraments; but almost none in the early days of the Reformation questioned the Christian doctrine of God. There was nothing unusual in the Church of England's holding to the historic Creeds, which were equally accepted as matter of course by Rome, Wittenberg, and Geneva.

But there are two ways in which Anglican hold on the Creeds has established a somewhat differentiated position in more recent times: (1) It has taken the ancient Creeds as theological *standards*, in preference to the metaphysical elaborations of the scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages, or to the legal elaborations of the equally scholastic theologians of the Reformation. This has resulted in a comparative simplicity in theological statement, which is in close conformity with the statements of the writers of the first age. (2) It has committed itself to the Theology of the Creeds in such a way as to be clearly distinguished from professing Christians who have expressly, or implicitly, abandoned definite Christian Theology.

The ancient Creeds were intended to express, and as a matter of fact do express, in the language of certain periods, the faith of the Gospels concerning God as revealed in Jesus Christ, no more and no less.

In face of what claimed to be better doctrines of God and theories of Christ than those of the Gospel, the Church said in effect: "We hold to the faith of the fathers. We take our Christology and our Theology direct from the Apostles. What the Gospels teach we still hold; and we summarise our belief as follows." Moreover, as against those who would say, "We are willing to accept certain details of the Gospel, such as portions of the Sermon on the Mount; but of course you cannot expect us to believe in the miraculous Birth and the Resurrection," the Creeds say: "Never mind the details; but hold to the great facts. We commit ourselves to the great central and crucial truths of the Virgin Birth, the Death, the Resurrection, the Ascension, Pentecost. The core of truth is there. All else is subsidiary."

The Creeds are only intelligible when we refer to the *intention* of their framers, which was *loyalty to apostolic presentation*, no more and no less, succinct expression of the doctrine of God, implied in the Gospels, and more clearly formulated by St. Paul and St. John. To hold the Creeds meant to refuse to abandon the Gospel Theology for any proposed substitute. This was the ancient function of the historic Creeds; and this function do they still perform. The all-important thing is their intention to be loyal to the New Testament teaching. Their language is the language of the time of their formulation; their details such details as were brought into accidental prominence by the controversies of particular periods. Language and arrangement

might be improved upon; or they might be wholly superseded by the language of another age; but as the thought intended is that of the Apostles themselves, to abandon them without providing some substitute *with identical meaning* would be to abandon the doctrine of the New Testament.

In the course of time, and not least in the present day, there have come many new solicitations to abandon Gospel truth. More loudly than ever before has the cry been raised that the Gospel is obsolete, and its teaching incredible, if not impossible. In the wake of both great schools of Continental Protestantism have followed open and secret disbelief, grave doubt, and widespread indifference. As a matter of fact, though not of theory, the Christology of the Creeds has been smothered in the mass of Protestant metaphysics dealing with justification and predestination, the rejection of which has often involved rejection of the ancient Theology lying behind it. The Anglican Church has not been unaffected by prevalent infidelity and agnosticism, and efforts have been made, though made in vain, to loose her from her traditional moorings. But she has not abandoned the Creeds, and in fact could not do so without ceasing to be herself. Among the many competing forms of Christianity, she is ranged with those who still believe in Jesus Christ as Himself God, and, accepting Him as Word of God made flesh, conceive of God as existing in threefold manner, holding to the mystery of the Trinity as the most reasonable clue to the meaning of human life and of the universe. She stands firm for the belief

that the central thought of the Christian religion, and the central fact of the world's history, is nothing less than God's Incarnation.

She maintains the threefold Gospel, which exhibits the Divine Love. As against dualism in any form, she holds to the Gospel of Creation, that the worlds came into being by an act of God's love, of which man with his measure of freedom is the last and highest illustration. God loved and created the universe. She holds also to the Gospel of Redemption, recognising man's actual need and degradation and the one remedy conducive to salvation. Man's misuse of freedom did not involve forfeiture of the Divine providence and compassion. "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son," who "humbled Himself even to the death of the Cross." God loved and stooped to redeem. She proclaims also the Gospel of Sanctification, that the Divine forces set in action by the coming of the Son of God to earth are still operative; and that "all that Jesus began both to do and to teach" before His Resurrection and Ascension is continued for those who draw near to Him. God loves and still works. Belief in God the Holy Ghost means, practically, belief in the present action of supernatural grace. God loving always and working always is the sum and substance of our belief; and our profession of this belief in the phraseology of classic formulæ is one method of witness to our firm conviction of the Godhead of "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever."

3. The doctrine of the Incarnation, that God

could make Himself known to man through man's own nature, and the doctrine of the Church, that God still works in the world as He did in the first days, are two applications of the same principle, two efforts of the human mind to express its apprehension of God's presence in the world, its conviction that to believe that God has intercourse with humanity is not only reasonable but necessary, if we maintain really noble views both of God's nature and of our own. Starting with the assurance that God assumed our nature, and used it as a medium for expressing Divine and eternal truth, we can go on to believe that Divine power and grace can still be transmitted to men who in faith will receive it. The mystical faculty, by which alone it is possible not to comprehend, but to feel, the truth of the Incarnation, is the same faculty by which we apprehend the truth about Sacraments. Anglicanism applies its Doctrine, and again shows its conservatism, by its mysticism¹ in maintaining the sacramental principle as it was maintained by the ancient Church. This might be illustrated by pointing out the substantial identity between Prayer Book teaching and that of

¹ *Mysticism.* Some people do not like the word "mystical," which suggests to them only the dreamy and unpractical; but the word expresses the fundamental truth of all religion, and must be used, unless it can be replaced by some substitute of identical meaning. It is approximately synonymous with "religious," and connotes apprehension (1) of the spiritual element in man himself, and (2) of the eternal context of all life. Normally developed man is conscious that his most characteristic experiences transcend the physical, and that the most reasonable explanation of all that is visible is that it consti-

the early fathers of the Church; but it will be more to the point to compare Anglican conservatism in sacramental doctrine with similar conservatism in another quarter during Reformation times.

In 1529 Martin Luther had a conference with Ulrich Zwingli at Marburg. They were discussing the doctrine of the Eucharist with a view to agreement, which might serve to bring together the two bodies of dissidents from the Latin Church, the Protestants and the Reformed, of which they were the respective leaders. They were utterly unable to agree; and the irreconcilable difference between them is an illustration not only of a difference in the general tendencies of the Saxon Reformation and the Swiss Reformation, but also by parable of the difference between the only two categories of sacramental teaching which it is generally worth while to consider: namely, those who believe that the outward and visible and material can become a means whereby we receive what is inward and spiritual, and those who do not, and cannot, believe anything of the sort. Luther, full of evangelical fervour, felt that it wronged the love of God to seem to detract anything from the literal meaning of our Lord's words; Zwingli, coldly rational, was not willing to concede anything of which he had not sensible proof, and felt that it was derogatory to the Almightyness of God

tutes a lesser part of a grander invisible whole. The mystical faculty is the instinct whereby man is conscious of the unseen and the Divine; and this instinct finds its supreme satisfaction in Christianity. A mystic is one who takes account of higher things that are and of highest things that must be.

to associate His special power with anything earthly. The fundamental difference between the two men, and between the two schools of thought which they represented, appeared in their basal conceptions of God. To Luther He was pre-eminently Love, and in consequence no depth of condescension was inconceivable; to Zwingli He was pre-eminently Power and Will, and to assume that He needed to employ material means, or that He seemed to work for change in the condition of men, seemed to conflict with the idea of His all-sovereignty and the irreversible character of His eternal decrees. In the discussion, Luther vehemently insisted on the reality of the presence of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist, and Zwingli denied it. In this they were types of radically different classes of men.

“I protest,” said Luther, “that I differ from my adversaries with regard to the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper, and that I shall always differ from them. Christ has said, ‘*This is My Body.*’ Let them show me that a body is not a body. I reject reason, common-sense, carnal arguments, and mathematical proofs. God is above mathematics. We have the word of God; we must adore it and perform it. . . . I do not ask what need we have of it; but I see it written, ‘*Eat, this is My Body.*’ We must therefore believe and do. . . . In the Eucharist the mouth receives the Body of Christ, and the soul believes in His words. . . . ‘*This is My Body.*’ The devil himself shall not drive me from that. To seek to understand it is to fall from the faith. . . . I know but one means to come to an understanding. Let

our adversaries believe as we do." "We cannot," answered the Swiss. "Well then," said Luther, "I abandon you to God's judgment, and pray that He will enlighten you." As they sat on opposite sides of a table, Luther had written on the table-cloth before him, *Hoc est Corpus Meum*, as a reminder of the one thought he wished to have in mind. When Zwingli was unaffected by his arguments or his fervour, he defiantly shook the table-cloth in his face! In accordance with Luther's teaching, the Augsburg Confession stated: "Of the Lord's Supper they teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to those who partake of the Lord's Supper; and they disapprove of those who teach otherwise."

In the stand he took at Marburg, Luther is a good illustration of the conservative attitude in regard to sacramental doctrine. Similarly, the Church of England refused to abandon sacramental mysticism in compliance with Swiss demands. It set out upon its work after the Reformation with an unchanged conviction that God draws near to strengthen His people in the Sacraments, which our Lord ordained for His Church, and that to believe this is to give proof of unfailing confidence in our Lord's redeeming love. For the purpose of this paper it is of more importance to call special attention to this one point than to examine in detail the differences between the sacramental teaching of the Prayer Book and that of mediæval formularies which it superseded. Yet it is necessary to indicate the chief ways in which the Prayer Book aimed at reversion to the

simpler teaching of the early Church as distinct from the complexities and subtleties of scholastic doctrine.

This appears first in the separation of the two great Sacraments generally necessary from the category of seven taught by the Latin Church. The authority of Peter Lombard, Master of Sentences, had gained currency for the idea of seven Sacraments, which is traceable to the eleventh century. At first, those who accepted the mystical number seven were not agreed as to which seven sacramental rites the list should include; but for three centuries prior to the Reformation theologians had taught the seven Sacraments as they are still taught in the Roman Church. When the Church of England confined its emphasis to Baptism and Holy Communion, it did so because of a wish to confine itself to the clear teaching and the proportion of the teaching of the New Testament.

There is a second great difference which is harder to define. The current theology had for some time been disposed to speak not so much of the spiritual presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in the Eucharist as of the presence of His Person. This change of language led to change in the central thought. To speak of the presence of our Lord's Body and Blood suggests at once that the reason of the presence is that they may become the food of the faithful. The central thought is that of Communion. To speak of the presence of His Person in the sacramental elements is to use language which fits in better with the idea that He is present to be

offered afresh as on the Cross. The central thought is that of vicarious sacrifice. While belief in the mystical presence of His Body and Blood as spiritual Gifts involves belief in the special presence of Himself as Giver of those Gifts, especially as it is of Himself that He gives, this is a different thing from the identification of the Gifts with the Person of the Giver. The Church of England, without obscuring either the connection of the Eucharist with the "one full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice" of which it is "a perpetual memory," or the fact that in the Eucharist we lift up our hearts unto the Lord, who still pleads the merits of that sacrifice, made its express teaching centre about the thought of the Eucharist's being our spiritual *food*, and—to use a common Reformation phrase—"turned the Mass into a Communion." "The Mass" was used not merely as the common name for the Eucharist, but to denote that method of using it which seemed to make it a vicarious act of the priest, in which normally the congregation had no share except as reverent spectators. The name "Holy Communion" is intended to emphasise that the primary command at the Institution was, "Take, *eat*."¹

The statements in Anglican formularies concerning the Sacraments are in close accord with the lan-

¹ A theological student once said to me that he considered the Words of Institution "less Catholic" than the definition of the Eucharist adopted by the Council of Trent! There are canons and canons of "Catholicity," and from his own standpoint the young man may have been right. He would have considered it more "Catholic" for our Lord, when He insti-

guage of Scripture, and represent a reversion to the mode of statement used in earlier days. They are in line with such statements as these which come to us from the middle of the second century. "We do not," writes Justin Martyr, "receive [the elements in the Communion] as common bread and common drink; but, as by the word of God Jesus Christ our Saviour became incarnate, and had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also the food made Eucharist by word of prayer from Him, food by which our blood and flesh are by a change nourished, is both Flesh and Blood, we have been taught, of that incarnate Jesus." In similar words, Irenæus writes: "For as bread from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but Eucharist, consisting of two things, both an earthly and a heavenly, so also our bodies, partaking of the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, but have the hope of the resurrection to eternity." This is only a slightly different way of saying what the Catechism means by its reference to "outward and visible sign" as "a means whereby we receive" "an inward and spiritual grace." It is in accord with both Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Luther, and the New Testament, that Queen Elizabeth, in what was not merely a clever evasion of a difficult question, but

tuted the Eucharist, to have taken bread and to have said, "This is I; adore and offer afresh." Whereas what He did say was, "This is My Body; take, eat." To make the thought of Communion central is merely to conform to the Words of Institution and to the comments of St. John and St. Paul.—F. J. K.

was also a statement with a good deal of depth, uttered the famous epigram:

“Christ was the Word who spake it;
He took the bread and brake it;
And what His word did make It;
That I believe and take It.”¹

In the categories of sacramental teaching, the crucial difference lies between those who believe in

¹ There is a striking passage in Professor Harnack's *Thoughts on Protestantism* (pp. 286, 289, 293. English Translation) in which he endeavors to trace to its beginnings that sacramental theology which in his view represents a corruption of simple primitive faith. But with that fearless frankness for which he is noted, he admits that the sacramental theology is to be found in the earliest evidence we have, namely, the writings of St. Paul and St. John. “No doubt the elements of water, bread, and wine are symbols, and the scene of operations is not laid in externals; still the symbols do actually convey to the soul all that they signify. Each symbol has a mysterious but real connection with the fact which it signifies. . . . The two most sublime spiritualists of the Church, namely, John and Origen, were the most profound exponents of the mysteries, while the great Gnostic theologians linked on their most abstract theosophies to realistic mysteries. *They were all sacramental theologians.* Christ, they held, had connected, and in fact identified, the benefits He brought to men with symbols, the latter being the channel and vehicle of the former, the man who participates in the unction of the holy symbol getting grace thereby.” . . . “The Apostle Paul was far from being a sacramental theologian, yet even he could not wholly avoid these mysteries, as is plain if one will but read the eleventh chapter of First Corinthians, and observe his speculations upon baptismal immersion. But Paul was the first and almost the last (Not quite the last, for Marcion and his disciples do not

the reality of grace given by Sacraments and those who deny it. There may be differences in application of the sacramental principle, and differences in the effort to explain the nature and method of the operation of what is after all incomprehensible and inexplicable. But those who believe in the Sacraments as veritable means of grace are so close together by fundamental conviction that differences in explanatory language count for comparatively little. In its sacramental teaching the Anglican Church has endeavoured to maintain the Apostolic tradition, and in an age in which the mystical in every form is widely, though not universally, disparaged, aligns itself with those who still hold to the early faith that Sacraments are true "means whereby we receive" Divine grace as well as sensible "pledges to assure us thereof." "God so *loved* the world that He *gave*

seem to have been sacramental theologians at all.) theologian of the early Church, in whom sacramental theology was really held in check by clear ideas and strictly spiritual considerations. After him all the floodgates were opened, and in poured the mysteries with their lore. In Ignatius, who is only sixty years later than Paul, they had already dragged down and engulfed the whole body of intelligent theology." "From the beginning it was not so, is the protest that will be entered. Perhaps. But one must go far back to find that beginning, so far back that this extremely brief period now eludes our search entirely."

That is to say: Those who cannot believe in the Incarnation of God, and who in consequence can have no use for a system which claims to convey supernatural grace, are bound to believe that there was a time when such things were not taught. But all the evidence that there is (except that of Marcion, who was condemned as heretic) teaches the miraculous events of

His only-begotten Son," is the doctrine of the Incarnation; God so *loves* the world that He *gives* perpetually, is its corollary and the doctrine of the Sacraments.

4. It seems like an abrupt descent to turn from what concerns the inmost relations of souls to God to consider what seems to be merely a matter of social necessity or convenience, the Historic Episcopate or the Historic Ministry. And if this ministry of the Church be no more than an ecclesiastical arrangement for practical utility, it has no right to place in the list of Christian essentials. No form of Church-government can claim recognition as of essential importance, unless it can be connected with our Lord Himself. Unless He inaugurated a society in which government of some sort was a necessity, and Himself determined the principle whereby

Christ's life, and that His disciples came to believe in Him as Divine; and that the rites He ordained were supposed to convey spiritual blessings. To accept the evidence is to believe this; to deny this is to throw over the evidence. Conservative Christianity holds to these first teachers. The teaching that the Sacrament of Baptism has a spiritual meaning similar to the physical mystery of birth, and that the Sacrament of the Holy Communion has a spiritual meaning similar to the physical mystery of taking food, comes to us through St. John from our Lord Himself. St. John believed it; St. Paul believed it; the Acts indicate that the Apostles put their belief into practice. We are in line with them when we seek not to fathom spiritual mysteries, but to believe in spiritual mystery as an essential part of human life, and to translate the meaning of these mysteries in terms not of grammar, nor of logic, but to compare them to the other mysteries which go to make up our life.

authority was to be exercised, there is no reason for attaching importance to any special form of organisation, or even to any organisation at all. There are those who maintain that the chief corrupting force in the Christian Church has been its social organisation; and if its social organisation is wholly independent of Christ, they are undoubtedly right.

If we are to justify the action of our Church in giving the Historic Episcopate a place in the category of Christian essentials, or are to approve the action of the Church of England and of our own in taking pains to preserve a succession of Bishops deriving descent from Bishops of the pre-Reformation Church, we must see that this system of government forms a necessary part of the Church inaugurated by our Lord, and that the principle of the ministry corresponds to some permanent human need. We must see that the principle of Orders is important as a test-case and illustration of the Church-principle. In fact, it would have been better if the Quadrilateral had specified not Historic Episcopate, but Historic Church.

The line of thought here suggested has been elaborated in a separate paper on *The Principle of Orders*. This section of the present paper has been, therefore, abridged. It will suffice to call attention to three points, which have bearing in different ways on the subject.

(a) The principle that ministerial authority was derived by laying on of hands which indicated apostolic descent seems to have been accepted in the early Church. It is only by doing violence to such testi-

mony as we possess that the idea can be read out of the Christian literature of the first two centuries. When this is done, it is due not so much to the inadequacy of the testimony as to prior conviction that any sacramental theory of the ministry is itself incredible. But if the antecedent possibility be admitted, it is at once apparent that the simplest explanation of one aspect of the history of the early Church is that there was substantial basis in fact for a theory, which, at any rate in the second century, was everywhere accepted. This fact of general acceptance is not by itself enough to establish the fact that the ministerial theory is of essential importance; but it invests it with a claim upon our serious consideration. The historic proof, which is offered for the fact, if fact it be, is not demonstrative but presumptive. There are many historical facts which can only be known as necessary hypotheses; and this fact—for that matter, every fact of this sort—is one of them. It cannot be shown, and need not be shown, what were the actual links in episcopal succession. These cannot now be traced farther than the seventh century; and it is certain that the links in the chain for the first three centuries will never be known. We only know actual details concerning the consecration of any given Bishop, when something unusual in the circumstances occasioned special comment in some early writer. For example, we know by whom hands were laid on St. Chrysostom, because the circumstances were unusual; we have no such knowledge of St. Athanasius, in whose case there was nothing unusual. Yet Athanasius' claim

to be regarded by posterity as a Bishop is precisely as good as Chrysostom's. The decisive evidence consists in proof of the acceptance of some general principle, not in detailed knowledge of its many applications. In this matter of episcopal consecrations it is not necessary that we know in every case, or in many cases, the exact personal links. It is enough, if the principle be established that right to minister in the Church came by derivation of authority from above. Knowledge of principle, not detailed knowledge of applications of the principle, is all that we require as evidence in any such case. If we know that certain officers were appointed in a certain way, the fact that any given man served in the office is sufficient proof that in his case the conditions of appointment were complied with. For example, we have no details—or very few—concerning the due election of Roman Senators either under the Republic or the Empire; yet we know what from time to time the requirements for election were. The mere fact that any given man served, and was recognised, as Roman Senator is sufficient proof that he was elected in due form. Similarly of Bishops. If we know on what principle they were appointed, the mere fact that any man acted, and was recognised, as Bishop is sufficient proof that he was appointed according to rule. Church History affords sufficient evidence, for those who do not reject the fact attested as antecedently improbable, and for those who do not demand a kind of proof which would be demanded in no analogous case, that the principle, whereby authority to minister in the Christian

Church was given, was that of derivation of authority from above along a line of official descent supposed to lead back to the Apostles, and through them to our Lord Himself. Such a succession was possible. It has been possible for the last twelve centuries, as may be demonstrated in great detail; it was equally possible for the first three centuries, if men had any reason for holding to it. The historical evidence is sufficient to establish as a necessary hypothesis for the understanding of Christian development, that this ministerial succession was a fact, if our presuppositions will allow acceptance of anything of the sort.¹

(b) It would seem to be a desirable thing that the historic episcopate be maintained from the standpoint of utility in the interests of the cause of Christian unity. Some government the Church, like every society, must have; and every effort to dispense with it has always resulted in the invention of some new form. Episcopacy has worked fairly well. But what recommends it in the interests of reunion is the fact that, irrespective of its claims to antiquity, it is at present possessed, in some form or other, by about

¹ This sounds very much like begging the question by bald assertion. The one thing I have wished briefly to indicate here is my conviction, merely as historical student, holding no brief for any theological or ecclesiastical position, that in this matter of the ministry a book like Gore's *Church and the Ministry* is much more fair in its weighing of evidence than many books maintaining different theories of the ministry, where the determining factor in the use of testimony is a clearly revealed preconception of the utter impossibility of any application of the sacramental principle.—F. J. K.

nine-tenths of the Christians of the world. It seems to offer special opportunities for corporate reunion. This, however, is an argument from mere expediency, and cannot justify insistence on it, if there be nothing else to say for it.

(c) The chief argument for it, however, is an argument from moral necessity. A form of ordination, expressive of the authority of Christ Himself, seems to be needed by those who undertake the work of the ministry. There is a practical need for a perpetual apostolate; and if so, there is a moral necessity for a perpetual apostolic commission. We know what our Lord did for the first set of men who were sent to speak and work in His Name. "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." "Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you and ordained you." "Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." That sort of thing is indispensable to those who are to go forth as ambassadors of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God. If in these days men are effectively to minister the Word and the Sacraments, they are in need of the same sort of authoritative commission. Any man who undertakes the work of the ministry must have the strength and comfort of a commission from the Lord whose servant he is, and for this assurance he must have some outward pledge of the reality of the inward call. No commission traceable to a merely human source has any special value; the commission only has value if it seems to connect us with our Lord Himself. If the ancient belief, that

the succession of Bishops in the Church gave the ministry in each generation a seal and pledge of our Lord's mission to them, and an assurance of the gift of the Holy Spirit for their work, be true, it only means that our Lord treats His latest followers as He treated those of the first generation; that He made provision for men by recognising the dependence of individuals for all things on the society, and the dependence of all society upon orderly government. But more than this, it means for the men called to minister in His Name, men of unclean lips and wavering wills, as we all are, that the unclean lips may be touched by a coal from the altar of God, so that, being cleansed, the man may say boldly but humbly, "Here am I; send me." The Church's theory of the ministry rightly understood is conducive not to ministerial arrogance, but to ministerial humility.

The four essentials go together. The value we attach to sacramental ordination to ministerial work will depend upon apprehension of the sacramental character of ministerial work, of what it means to minister the sacraments of grace and truth, to act and to speak in the Name and Power of Christ. The value we attach to ministerial work will depend in turn on apprehension of the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son of God. If we have the Pauline and Johannine conviction that Christianity means not only that God Himself came into this world as the man Jesus Christ, but that also the incarnate Son is at this present moment continuing by His Apostles all that He began on earth both to do and

to teach; if we believe our Lord's present existence and activity, we can believe in His mystical, supernatural Church; and if we believe in the mystical Church as His Body, we can see and feel that all life according to the New Testament conception is shot with Divine fire, and is mystical, from beginning to end. If we can apprehend, or allow ourselves to be apprehended of, Him who is the whole of New Testament thought, then the New Testament in all its aspects will become more and more real to us. If we believe that God really appeared on earth to draw near to man, it is impossible not to believe that He still comes close to every soul; and we can then understand the strength and the comfort of all the sacramental ordinances of the Church. The only way to have true hold on the meaning of ecclesiastical system is to be filled with evangelical fervour. The burning love of Christ in the soul of the individual believer resulting in the missionary longing that every other man shall draw near to Him in the same way, gives the only means either of knowing or of spreading "the faith once delivered to the saints." It also enables us to understand the meaning of St. John's saying: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in Himself: he that believeth not God hath made Him a liar: because he believeth not the record that God gave of His Son. And this is the record, that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in His Son."

III

ANGLICAN PROGRESSIVENESS

ANGLICAN Conservatism never aimed at mere antiquarian revival. Whatever stress was laid on the necessity of harking back to the primitive Church for principles, there was never suggestion of harking back to the primitive Church for methods of application. No one ever thought of trying to revive customs determined by social conditions of the first century, or by the fact that the Christian Church was in early days exposed to persecution. There was recognition of the need of adaptability to requirements of the modern world, and a welcome of the changes ushered in by the new era. Ultra-conservatism in theory went hand in hand with utilitarian versatility in practice. That Anglican conservatism was linked to a vital principle of progressive adaptability appears clearly if it be contrasted with the two chief types of conservative Christianity, especially when they are considered with reference to such things as all types of conservative Christianity have in common.

Greek conservatism, for example, looks back to the age of the General Councils as the golden age of the Church's history; and aims at perpetuating not only the principles, but also the spirit and atmos-

phere, of the conciliar period. It is its boast that since the period of the councils there has been no change; and on the whole the boast is justified by facts. In the Greek Church the thought and customs of the age of the Emperor Justinian and St. John Damascene have been projected into the world of to-day; and with the world of to-day this sixth-century form of Christianity shows but slight disposition to come to terms. It is largely true to say that the Eastern Orthodox Christianity presents an example of arrested development. It is Christianity with all the salient marks of the Christianity of the early ages; but it is distinctly a Christianity which has never outgrown a form and temper, as we measure things, at least fourteen centuries behind the times.

Similarly, Roman Catholicism endeavours to perpetuate the form as well as the spirit of a bygone age. In most of its phases, intellectual and political, as well as theological and ecclesiastical, it is a phenomenon of the thirteenth century. Pope Innocent III and St. Thomas Aquinas represent the last terms of its development. Formulated scholasticism has been taken as the last word in Christian thought, and formulated feudalism as the ultimate solution of the Church's relations to human society. It has defiantly refused to make terms with the modern spirit, and demands of the modern spirit an unconditional surrender to institutions which belong chiefly to one country in the later Middle Ages. While the Greeks in effect demand that the intellectual apprehension of Christianity be narrowed to the conceptions of

a few generations of not very remarkable Bishops, the Roman Church in effect demands that the policy and polity of the Catholic Church be restricted by the ecclesiastical necessities of mediæval Italy.

As contrasted with these types, there is place for one which, while wholly conservative in principle, should endeavour to cultivate a truly Catholic temper by developing all its powers of adaptability and assimilation. It cannot be maintained that such a character has been exemplified by the Churches of the Anglican Communion; yet something of this sort lies at the very core of Anglican theory. While there is no ground for boasting, the ideal ought to act as a stimulus to effort, and as warning in its reminder of comparative failure. It is our aim to secure identity of truth combined with constant change in the mode of its expression, identity of principle combined with constant change in the mode of its application.

We have considered the history of the English Reformation in reference to its effort to retain the essential marks of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church; we have still to consider the same history in relation to the spirit of the new age, which begins with the Reformation period. In considering the progressive aspect of its character, it cannot be shown that there has been steady advance, or that there has been advance along a clearly defined line. The changes in England in the sixteenth century involved many temporary, and a few permanent, losses. There has been, and still is, great danger that Anglicanism may be fettered by the sixteenth-

century English mould in which it was first cast; or that, especially in this country, it may confuse certain temporary exigencies with the permanent conditions of its work. Yet close scrutiny of the history will show that there has been evolution of a new religious type, and that there has been frequent, if not constant, effort to do the oldest things in the newest kinds of ways. There has been constant effort more and more to realise the meaning of religious freedom.

This adaptability on principle may be illustrated by reference to changes in (1) the religious ideal, (2) the educational ideal, (3) the devotional ideal, (4) the moral ideal, (5) the political ideal.

1. The Church of England has been deeply affected by the Evangelical spirit, which in modern times owes its special emphasis to the influence of the Reformation in Germany. The direct influence of Martin Luther in England was very slight; but eventually the force of his positive principles made itself felt in England as it did in every country of Northern Europe. Luther was a strange combination of conflicting principles, always intense and usually precipitate, appearing at his best in his earliest years, when he was struggling for faith and peace, a man of undoubted genuineness and depth of spirituality, giving himself unreservedly to the service of God. In him were contradictory elements of impetuous fervour and incautious rationalism; but it is on his evangelical, emotional side that he was at his best and his strongest; and it is to this side that he owes his unique importance. The keynote to all

his teaching, as in the case of St. Augustine, was given by his own personal religious experience. As a monk struggling to serve God in such a way as to gain peace, he was directed by his confessor to meditate on St. Paul's teaching of justification by faith. In this he found the lesson he needed for himself; and this he proclaimed as the one lesson most needed by the religious world of his day. He was right. The great danger of the time was that religion as an individual thing should be lost sight of in the identification of religion with the worldly interests of ecclesiastical corporations which had become corrupt; and that even the best should accept correct and beautiful external forms as substitutes for the inner devotion and consecration of the heart. The burden of Luther's message, the heart of all Evangelicalism, was the necessity of personal religion, the knowledge that the heart of religion lies in the union of the individual soul with God. This is the secret of such strength as Protestantism has possessed, and lies at the basis also of the best developments of modern Roman Catholicism. To make this felt was to change the prevailing religious ideal and to claim for the spirit of St. Paul a place in the forefront of all Christian development.

While the Church of England was not directly influenced by Luther, it did accept in a general way the spirit of the great German reformer; and in its absorption of the moderate Puritans showed its desire to make place and home for this type of sturdy devotion to duty, and to gain the strength which was displayed in an especial degree by the children

of Swiss Reform. Moreover, in the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century, it claimed and gained for itself a greater degree of evangelical spirit. This revival laid, in an exaggerated but permanently effective form, sufficient emphasis on the need of individual conversion, and on the spirit of missionary activity as the inevitable result of fervent conviction; so that it may well be maintained that as part of its heritage the Anglican Church possesses that spirit of individual piety and emotional devotion which is the characteristic product of Reformation influence, and is akin to one side of the teaching of the Apostle St. Paul.

2. The English Reformation also broadened the scope of popular education. The New Learning exalted new standards as authoritative, and as against the Schoolmen made appeal to Scripture and to History. In the discussions of the period, constant reference was made to the Christian *sources*; and in particular there was fine training of a new generation of Biblical and historical scholars in the University of Cambridge. The English Reformation, based on sound learning, resulted in the encouragement of sound learning. This result was only gradually attained. The attacks made on schools and universities by Henry VIII and Edward VI brought about an actual decrease in the amount of education diffused among the masses of the subjects of those kings; but the learning they fostered excelled in quality that which it superseded, and was associated with a love of learning for its own sake, which was to achieve happy results in future.

There was much appeal to the authority of Holy Scripture, and more and more of study of Holy Scripture. In the Catechism, Homilies, and Exhortations of the Prayer Book effort was made to explain the meaning of the Christian faith and practice by constant reference to God's Holy Word; and this set a fashion generally followed. Moreover, the deeper study of the history of the early Church taught lessons of historical perspective which had many practical applications.

Besides these religious studies, there was all the new knowledge of different kinds which came at the dawning of a new era in the world's history; and to all new ideas and new conceptions of the universe and life the English schools gave hearty welcome. The result has been that the English type of education, which has been carried all over the world, and has reached some of its highest developments in this country, has been one that is broad in scope and usually religious in character. The standards of education throughout the English-speaking world have always been of the highest; and this fact may be connected, even in those phases which have little or no direct connection with the English Church, with the religious movement which that Church inaugurated. It is the Church of England which produced the English Bible, although the use of it has been as wide as English-speaking Christianity. This one instance may be taken as an illustration of the extent of the intellectual influences which the Reformation in England set in motion.

Connected with this aspect of the history is the fact that in the Church of England there has been since the seventeenth century a growing spirit of liberalism. The idea of religious toleration is nowhere more than two hundred and fifty years old. The English Church was long in learning the lesson, though slightly in advance of most of its rivals. But in recent times the spirit not only of tolerance for those whose beliefs are different, but also—which is a step further in advance—of appreciation, has been rapidly growing. This spirit has been increasingly powerful during the last fifty years. It may be ranked as a principle of action, that the Anglican Communion has studiously developed a policy of sympathetic understanding and co-operation, and has aimed at appropriation of truth and usefulness as presented from all sides. It is possible to trace from the earliest period of the Reformation in England the working of this instinct of assimilation.

3. The changes in worship aimed at giving it an intelligible and congregational character. The use of the English tongue in parts of the old services was only the first and most obvious in a series of changes which aimed at making every portion of the Church's worship intelligible to all the people. There was no change in the substance or structure of the Church's chief rites; but effort was made to render their significance obvious, and to provide for due participation on the part of all the congregation. The Prayer Book ideals, as contrasted with what they superseded in the matter of worship, are

simplicity and heartiness. The meaning and aim of its Offices are sadly missed, if their congregational character be obscured. As contrasted with rites in which almost everything was left to clergy as proxies for the congregation, emphasis was given to the conception of the priestly congregation joining with its official functionary in the discharge of the Church's worship with heartiness as well as intelligence. This special principle of the Church of England in matters liturgical has received too little recognition; but it is a sort of charter-principle that she stands pledged to the ideals of congregational worship and liturgical flexibility.

In this connection reference may be made to the Anglican contributions to Christian Hymnody. No portion of the Christian Church has produced more or more admirable sacred poetry or more moving music for its expression. In ecclesiastical architecture, painting, and sculpture the Anglican Church has made no advance. The best she possesses is either inherited or copied. But her schools of hymn-writers and of composers of sacred music have done much work that is unique. This is in line with the special practical functions to which reference has just been made. Others have made worship more impressive, and have established standards of dignity and grandeur; but none have striven harder to make it intelligible to simple minds and appealing to simple consciences.

4. More important than these changes in some ways was a change in moral ideals. The most striking illustration of this appears in the suppression

of the English monasteries. On the part of King Henry VIII this suppression was an act of unscrupulous plunder. The history of it is a monotonous record of iniquities; it stands as one of the great brazen-faced hypocrisies of all history. Yet the iniquity lay not in the suppression, but in the method of its accomplishment. The significant fact is that the suppression was acquiesced in by the English nation as a whole, which has never seen fit to revive the monastic system in its old form, when revival was possible. Men's blood boiled at the measures of injustice meted out to the unfortunate monks, whom they knew not to be such monsters as were described by those who wished to pillage their property; but there was a general feeling that the monastic institutions were becoming obsolete. The English-speaking world no longer accepts the monastic ideal, namely, that professional asceticism represents the highest form of Christian perfection. While the ascetic principle has its place in all Christian life, there is no longer the belief among us that the best men and women must immure themselves as monks and nuns. We recognise that the monastic life is preferable for a few, and that for some it affords special opportunities of service; but it is regarded as exceptional rather than as normal, rather as an occasional necessity than as something ordinarily, or even often, desirable. Its special efficacy has been finely illustrated by the religious orders of the Anglican Church formed in recent years; but not even in the religious orders themselves has there been a revival of the once prevalent idea that the

highest morality can only be developed in monastic seclusion.

Before the Reformation the monastic ideal was everywhere supreme. The monastic life was *par excellence* the "religious" life; and, after Gregory VII, celibacy and a certain amount of "regularity" was required even of "secular" clergy. The English Reformation abolished monks and nuns, and permitted the clergy to marry. This meant a great change in old conceptions. The ideal Christian perfection was looked for not in monastic, but in domestic, life. The Christian family was regarded as the normal school for training in piety. Opposition to monasticism was due partly to worldly dislike of unworldly ideals; but that did not constitute its chief ground. There was a general conviction that the monasteries had outlived their special usefulness; and also a feeling that Christian influence could best be exerted in the midst of society, rather than by holding aloof from it. It was felt that life in the world, though not of it, afforded the best means of spreading the Kingdom of God. The change in ideal was intended to emphasise the essential holiness of family life and society life, and to place the Church and its officers in a position of vantage by putting them more closely in touch with those whom they were pledged to serve. A conception of ecclesiastical transcendence was succeeded by a conception of ecclesiastical immanence. It is not for a moment to be supposed that ideals and motives such as these actuated King Henry or his tools in suppressing monasteries. But the people of Eng-

land allowed the abolition of the monastic system, and eventually adopted such principles as gave theoretical justification.

With the change in the conception of what constituted the specifically religious life came change in the conception of the scope of the Church's activities. More and more was the Church to concern itself with social questions of every sort, not as external critic and law-giver, but as sympathetic interpreter of popular aspirations, and as vitally interested sharer in general interests. It is a striking feature in modern Anglican history that no class of priests or ministers in any part of the Christian world have been more effective men of affairs than its clergy, or more able to bring the Church's influence to bear on many questions of practical importance. This widening of the scope of religious and ecclesiastical activities is a direct result of the change in ideal, which is less correctly described as a secularising of the religious than as a consecrating of the secular. The modern interest of the Church in all educational, economic, political, and national, as well as in specifically theological and ethical, questions may be traced to the same cause.

5. The Reformation in general represented a revolt of the individual conscience from a social tyranny; and in all its phases it endeavoured to safeguard individual right. Akin to this was the effort made to safeguard the rights of the larger individual, the nation. Germany, following Luther's lead, had been patriotically zealous to throw off Italian fetters; England, accepting Henry VIII at

his own valuation, loyally supported his effort to vindicate national rights; Scotland, following John Knox, threw off the religious yoke of Rome, and, following the Fathers of the Covenant, refused the religious yoke of England. Religion and patriotism were blended, if not identified. One great reason for the spread of reforming tendencies in England was the belief that they were pre-eminently English; and the most obvious limitation of the movement was its tendency to be merely and solely English. Yet proper regard for the national principle ought to lead on to conceptions broader still. National rights demand recognition and protection; and it is only through sense of the meaning of the national that we can rise to the meaning of the international. If the national point of view be rightly held, it represents a stage on the way to conceptions as wide in scope as humanity. The superficial history of the English Reformation would indicate only that the selfish interests of the Italian Curia in subjugating the Church had been replaced by equally selfish interests of the English monarchy. No Pope made more absolute claims to supremacy than were sometimes made for the English Tudors; while under the Stuarts devotion to the reigning house was identified with "the doctrine of the Cross." But there is in Anglican theory something which has held the national in due subordination to Catholic conceptions. This has been shown by the successful activity of the English Church system in those portions of the British Empire in which it is virtually independent of the Crown and Parliament, and also

in the American Republic. Cultivation of the national spirit and the development of national character are signs of something in Anglicanism. The influence of our own Church in fostering the highest type of Americanism is an example of this. The Reformation stimulus to national aspiration must be regarded as a distinct, but not unmixed, blessing; while, nevertheless, it is necessary to be regarded as but a step in advance, rather than as the limit of progress.

It is curious to trace the developments under different guises of Anglican Royal Supremacy. When Royal Supremacy was substituted for Papal, it was assumed that the Church needed a master, and that the clergy needed lay-control. There was the more insistence that clergy were amenable to law, from the fact that formerly they had claimed exemption from certain obligations resting upon other citizens. In the reaction they were exposed to special taxation and some persecution. Emphasis was given to the fact that ultimate authority was executed by the Crown, or by laymen acting as the Crown's representatives. The Royal Supremacy established by Henry VIII was translated during the reign of his son into the supremacy of a Privy Council, and then into the modified supremacy of two Queens of different tendencies; while under the Stuarts the claims made for the Crown were greater in language than had been made under the Tudors. When monarchy was overthrown, the supremacy over the Church was assumed by Parliament; and with Parliament it has largely rested since. In the present constitutional

monarchy, the supremacy is largely exercised by the Prime Minister, with the result that the higher Church-appointments depend upon the result of political elections. At the present moment the Church of England cannot legislate for herself except through a Parliament only one member of which is bound to be a Churchman; and Bishops may be chosen, as has happened in the past, by men of no religious beliefs whatever. The question may well be raised whether the subjection of the English Church to King and Parliament is so great an improvement upon subjection to the Pope, after all.

This question does not have direct practical bearings for ourselves. Our Church is free to act for itself, as the mother Church of England has not been since the earliest period of her history. Yet Royal Supremacy is not wholly absent from the American Church. When royal authority was superseded in America by the authority of popular assemblies, there was apparently the feeling that such authority over the Church as had been exercised by the Crown should now be exercised by duly elected conventions. The conventions, it is true, were to consist of Churchmen; but there has sometimes been an indefensible democratic supremacy, when supreme deference has been paid to conventions as such, without reference to the fitness of their constituent members to pass judgment upon difficult religious and ecclesiastical questions. Royal Supremacy is only defensible on the theory that the King in governing the Church is—to use a phrase of Dr. Moberly's—"a Churchman acting Churchmanly." The reference of

Church questions to tribunals in which the laity constitute the predominant influence is only defensible upon the same supposition. When in the dearth of Churchmen the management of affairs which have a spiritual bearing is entrusted to Vestrymen and others who are not communicants, there is a revival under democratic form of that tyranny over the Church which must trace its historical pedigree to King Henry VIII and the Popes!

But if to this source we may trace a phenomenon among ourselves which indicates restriction upon the liberty of a spiritual society, we may trace to the same source the restoration of the laity to their rightful place of share in responsibility for the whole of the Church's work. The Reformation rightly insisted that there is no difference in character, though there be in function, between the clergy and the laity. From this some have inferred a denial of the spiritual character of the clergy and of the society in which they are officers. Quite the contrary is true. The proper inference is that the spiritual function of the clergy is indication of the spiritual character of the laity, who are equally members of the mystical Body of Christ. One of the chief lessons of Anglican history is the importance of recognising the spiritual character and responsibility of the Christian layman.

The chief application of the principle of adaptability, and the crowning combination of all progressive tendencies, is to be found in the missionary work of the Anglican Churches. Other conservative Christians have shown equal readiness for self-sacrifice in

the missionary cause; other progressive Christians have shown equal desire to keep pace with modern ways; but none have excelled, if any have equalled, the missionaries of the Anglican Communion in ability to translate the ancient faith into intelligible terms of life, as known to peoples newly won for Christ. There has been not only wholesome diversity of methods in missionary work, but also an exhibition of the secret of all deepest influence, "penetrative imagination," which can apprehend the "soul of goodness in things evil" in those whom it wishes to help. There has been a just appreciation of the "good in everything," which Christianity seeks to explain and develop, and appreciation of what Christianity can itself gain from newly converted nations. There has been a useful something corresponding to St. Paul's "Not as though I had already attained, either were already made perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." It is one mark of the progressive spirit that there should be the humility of open-mindedness, not only in Christians as individuals, but also in Christians as Churches. There can be no growth without consciousness of imperfection.

The Anglican Church has never claimed to be infallible. Those who seek short and easy solutions of all problems by one act of surrender to infallible authority can never be wholly satisfied with her. In the sixteenth century men might choose the infallibility of Rome or the more confident infallibility of Geneva; and many were repelled by the hesitancy

of the Church of England. Something similar has always been true. Our Church has faults; and she sometimes has grace to own them: there are many things she does not know, and she sometimes admits it. The modesty of her claims may suffer by contrast with those of powers claiming to be infallible and impeccable; but it has the advantage of keeping close to truth and to necessary conditions of human life. Truth has always been the lodestar of Teutonic peoples, and it ought to dominate every development of Teutonic religion. This devotion forms part of our religious heritage and ought to characterise every feature of our work.

The history of the Church is replete with warnings that the Word of God may be made of none effect by the traditions of men, if traditions be not kept true and pure by constant testing by "the word and the testimony." Any form of Christianity which shall succeed in keeping the tradition in perpetual touch with the testimony will give to the world ideal Christianity of a sort as yet but imperfectly realised. It is desirable that constitutional conservatism be combined with constitutional progressiveness; but it must be recognised that both are thereby constitutionally limited. The conservatism must not become a mere mummy of religion; nor must progress mean departure from primitive bases. Advance there may be in every direction; but widening of circumference must mean no change of centre, and advance must not mean breaking away from the centre. Anglican progressiveness is confined to a New Testament base.

It is perfectly conceivable that this Anglicanism should cease to exist. From present indications it appears that a number of the religious systems and ecclesiastical institutions, which originated in the sixteenth century, are passing out of existence. Strict Lutheranism has almost disappeared from Germany, though it survives in certain portions of America; strict Calvinism is in all its former strongholds apparently evanescent. More and more does it seem likely that the alignment in future is to place in one camp the maintainers of the historic faith of the New Testament over against various forms of Unitarianism, which are likely more and more explicitly to abandon the New Testament, recognising that the miraculous element is everywhere interwoven in its tissue. If this be true, the future of Christianity will lie with that Communion which can best vindicate its claim to represent the religion of the New Testament, that is, Christianity according to the apostolic norm. Anglicanism is one of the forms of Christianity which claim to perpetuate this. If its claim be not valid, it had best make way for a Christianity which can better vindicate the claim, and the sooner the better. But so long as it does exist, and so long as it can give any reasonable justification for its existence, it must bear consistent witness to the Scriptural principles of the Incarnation and the Church. Its characteristic contribution to Christian development, however that contribution be combined with others, must be the instinct of giving the ancient spirit a truly modern expression. This is the ideal which challenges us to stricter and sterner

effort than we have hitherto shown to give it approximate realisation.

A broad outlook over the Christian world at the present day would seem to indicate that there is place and demand for that special emphasis and those special activities which, according to our history, it seems the privilege of Anglicanism to give. It cannot be claimed that her mission has been hitherto discharged with unusual or brilliant success. Yet it can be claimed that, in spite of flagrant sins of omission, her history has displayed manifest tokens of the workings of the Spirit of God. She has failed in her consistent witness to, and use of, sacramental force, and in adaptability to the needs of some of the humbler classes of society. She has committed sundry secular and aristocratic sins, and has been shamefully proud of them. On the other hand, she has displayed distinguished excellence in her consecration of scholarship to Scriptural exposition, in her liturgical provision for the educated, and chiefly in far-sighted provision for missionary work. She has possessed certain learned virtues, a fair amount of eminent respectability and practical common-sense; and yet has missed certain finer forms of Christian character, and, in spite of claims to adaptability, has failed to make proper appeal to men of all tastes and temperaments.

The Churches of the Anglican Communion have special opportunities for advance in those countries to which they have special mission, and special opportunities also to act as an educational and civilising influence for the whole world. In the British

Empire there are opportunities for world-wide activities based on world-wide views, which ought to produce the most intelligent type of modern Catholicism. In the United States our own Church has special opportunities of learning the lesson of adaptability from her closeness to men representing all types and temperaments from all nations of the earth. In no place is there so great need for firmness in conviction and flexibility in practice as in a nation composed of so many elements as the American; in no place is there greater opportunity for working out the real meaning of Catholicity.¹ The Church's opportunity constitutes a greater justification than its actual achievements; yet, fairly judged, it can stand the test of comparison with the most powerful religious influences of modern times. Its consciousness of the presence of the Holy Spirit working in and through it should make it fearless; while the memory of sins and omissions should make

¹ The terms "Catholic" and "Catholicity" as applied to conceptions of Christianity are ambiguous terms. "Catholic" is used by some people with the intention of meaning everything in general; whereas, all they seem to succeed in meaning is nothing in particular. It is used by others with reference to tiny bits of things in particular, but in such a way as never to arrive at anything in general! Neither vague expansiveness nor microscopic particularity rightly defines it; yet both have a share in its connotation. The first class of people wish to use it of a philosophy universal in its scope; the second, of certain details, which are mystical in significance. Both universality and mysticism are ingredients of Catholicity which must be taken as synonymous with primitive and Christian conceptions, containing broadly philosophical and genuinely spiritual ideas, which other systems lack. These have their

and keep it humble. The thought of ideals should not make us boastful. They ought to encourage by their intrinsic nobility; but they ought also to humiliate by their reminder of failure. If our work be at all effective, it will show something of the spirit of St. Paul, whom Anglicans have wished to appropriate as being in a special sense their patron saint. And it may be said that no other form of conservative Christianity is so ambitiously Pauline, and that no modern form of Christianity is more conscientious in its effort to be loyal to all sides of the Pauline doctrine. Like the great Apostle, our Communion endeavours to preach the one Gospel, which came "by revelation of Jesus Christ"; and like him it wishes to be "made all things to all men, that by all means it might save some." But there is need of heeding St. Paul's injunction to "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

basis in the New Testament presentation of the Person of Christ. He is viewed, first, in reference to the universe as "the firstborn of all creation," "by whom the worlds were made"; and, second, in reference to His mystical indwelling in His Church, "which is His Body, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all." A Catholic is one who, according to New Testament standards, is both philosopher and mystic; who, with broadest possible views of God and the world, is able to conceive of God's working in the world in manifold and minutest ways. To be Catholic-minded means, or ought to mean, to be in the way of becoming intellectually broad and spiritually deep.—F. J. K.

THE PRINCIPLE OF ORDERS

IV

THE PRINCIPLE OF ORDERS

THIS paper is written with a twofold object. It aims, first, at stating an issue, and, second, at indicating the way in which, in the opinion of the writer, the issue is to be met. The first of these aims is the more important. The paper will have answered its purpose, if it state a dilemma in such a way as to stimulate thought, even if, in giving an outline of reasons for choosing one horn of the dilemma rather than the other, it fail to formulate thought. Clear statement is the necessary preliminary to any discussion; and any contribution toward clear statement of data, or clear apprehension of issues involved, has a real, though it may be subordinate, use. The general problem, of which certain aspects are here considered, is that of the Principle of Holy Orders.

1

At the present time our Church is confronted by questions of critical import. It is asked in general to reconsider its traditional position in the light of modern religious developments; and in particular to see whether the interests of Christian unity do not require the abandonment, or at least modifica-

tion, of its implied theory of the Christian ministry. Some of our fellow-Churchmen no longer hold the strict Anglican view that episcopal ordination is necessary for valid ministry in the Church; and we are all forced to consider whether this position does not represent an advance in religious thought, a true revival of evangelical principle, which our Church as a whole ought to make its own. It is becoming apparent that the Church must either vindicate her principles of authority and government more fully than she has done in the past, or surrender them for the sake of closer relations with other Christians.

The chief ground for disliking or suspecting the idea that Church authority is inextricably identified with the episcopate is the apparent conflict between this idea and the spirit and interests of unity. Christian unity is the chief thing we wish to promote. It is the hope, as well as the boast, of our Church that it lies within her province to do special work for this cause. We have thought of it and talked of it for a long time; and it seems obvious that our country offers opportunities for working out some details of the unity-problem for the benefit of the world. We wish now to act rather than to talk; and in appealing to others to abandon the "hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly union and concord," from which we pray to be delivered, we wish, out of justice and chivalry, to meet advances more than halfway, and to surrender positions and prejudices of our own, which are obstacles to closer relations with brethren, to whom we are near at heart, though sundered by ecclesiastical bar-

riers. No man can be a good Christian and good Churchman who has not a great and growing desire to make practical contribution to the work of unity, and who is not willing to pay a great price for advance toward realisation of our Lord's last prayer for His Church. As a matter of fact, we are all keen to broaden and deepen our sympathies that they may in some degree correspond to the universality of our Lord's intention for His Gospel; and we are ready to make any surrender which principles and interests of the Gospel faith demand. The will to further the cause of unity is present, as is also the determination to give it practical expression within the present generation. It is urged upon us that the only way in which this will and determination can be carried out is by working for unity among the Protestants of America.

This spirit has a striking background in the history of our Church. It received classic expression in the "Memorial" of 1853, forever to be associated with the memory of William Augustus Muhlenberg, who declared the primary aim of his "Evangelical Catholicism" to be "the effecting of a Church unity in the Protestant Christendom of our land." "To become," he wrote, "a central bond of union among Christians, who, though differing in name, yet hold to the one faith, the one Lord, and the one baptism, and who need only such a bond to be drawn together in closer and more primitive fellowship, is here believed to be the peculiar province and high privilege of a college of Catholic and Apostolic Bishops *as such*." Hence was sought "some ecclesi-

astical system, broader and more inclusive than, . . . though surrounding and including, the Protestant Episcopal Church as it now is." The same spirit has received emphasis and practical advocacy in recent years in the teaching and achievements of William Reed Huntington. The chief contention of leaders such as these, that the liturgical forms of the Book of Common Prayer are not to be pressed as indispensably necessary to intercommunion, has been fully established. It is accepted on all sides as matter of course that liturgical uniformity is not essential to the maintenance of the Christian faith.

The question is now raised whether, as an apparent extension of the work thus begun, we should not relegate the ministry to the category of non-essentials. While the cause of unity can ignore no section of the Christian world, we are bound as practical men to do what we can along such lines as are open in our day; and we are reminded that work along these lines would be simplified by less rigorous theories of Church-polity than our formularies, strictly interpreted, teach. Our actual problem is often described somewhat as follows:

We cannot now hope for any union with the Roman Communion. Rome defies the world and will have communion only on terms of unconditional surrender to conceptions which, in comparatively recent times, she has defined as Catholic and necessary articles of faith. She knows no such word as compromise. From our standpoint it is as true now as when Archbishop Laud uttered the words, that "there can be no union with Rome, until Rome be

other than she is." And Rome shows no signs of being "other." It seems plain that, however much we know that united Christendom above all else must embrace the millions of subjects of the Roman Papacy, the time for that is not to be within our generation. Such hopeful signs as have appeared in Rome within twenty-five years have led only to new defiance and the erection of new barriers. We cannot omit our Roman cousins from our prayers; but thought of present reunion lies without the realm of practical possibility. They demand a surrender which, with our beliefs concerning the Gospel and the early Church, we can neither in reason nor in conscience make. From the practical standpoint, therefore, it seems that Rome must be eliminated.

Moreover, there would seem to be little more that is promising in the ancient Communions of the Greek Patriarchates. Theoretically, they are very attractive; but actually they seem to present a development arrested fourteen centuries ago; and their ignorance,—and unfortunately we must add,—insincerity, and suspicion of the intellectual and political ideals of the modern world, to which we cannot shut our eyes, make them seem remote. We can only deal with them as backward peoples deeply in need of education and missionary philanthropy. These we are glad to give; but we cannot buy ecclesiastical unity at the expense of reversion to a condition of things more archaic than the feudalism of Rome. The occasional exchange of social amenities is all that now seems possible. On the side of the older Communions of Christendom it seems that there is

nothing which we Anglicans can now do. No deaf adders were ever more reserved and unapproachable than our Greek great-grandmother and our Roman aunt.¹

But it is very different when we look in the other direction toward our Protestant cousins and brothers-in-law. We understand them; we can discuss matters with them; and they are open to conviction. The spirit of love and Christian fellowship fills us both; and the time seems ripe for our getting together. Every atom of charity and chivalry in us is tingling to show our appreciation of them, and our desire to be at one with them in some definite practical way.

And the special barrier between us and them is "the Historic Episcopate." Not that people object to an episcopate, even though historic, if it make no exclusive claims. But to insist on episcopal ordination is to place a stumbling-block. Episcopalians are aloof from other Protestants because of the arrogance of the claim of Apostolic Succession. To give up the Apostolic Succession as a theory would simplify matters greatly; even if Bishops were

¹ Such a statement as this does not do justice to the actual conditions in the Roman and Greek Communions, though it does state accurately enough the superficial aspects of the practical problem. In the Roman Communion are strong evangelical and liberal elements which are constantly growing stronger, and may before long exercise a dominant influence in the Curia; in the Greek Communion there are much more life and progressiveness than is ordinarily recognised, as they know well who have close acquaintance with the Church of Russia.

retained as picturesque adjuncts of circuit-conferences and fashionable weddings. The concession which the Protestant world especially asks of the Anglican Churches is that the theory of Episcopalian polity be no longer pressed. The obvious blessings which have followed the workings of non-episcopal ministries seem to afford sufficient proof that episcopal ordination is not a matter of necessity. The Holy Spirit does not confine Himself to episcopal channels. To quote the Bishop of Birmingham: "We must recognise that upon the basis of rebellion [from the Historic Episcopate] there have arisen Christian churches with a noble and continuous record of spiritual excellence—exhibiting, both in individuals and corporately, manifest fruits of the Spirit alike in learning, in virtue, and in evangelical zeal. To deny God's presence with them, and His co-operation in their work and ministry, would seem to approach to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. We cannot express in words too strong our assurance that God has been with them, and that we are meant to learn from their saints and teachers, and to sit at their feet as before those who possess God's Spirit."¹ Facts like these and the practical needs of the United States seem to demand the dropping of such exclusive claims as have been made for historic Anglican Orders.

In addition to this, these claims are opposed not only from the standpoint of practical ecclesiastical politics, but also from that of the popular ideals

¹ Gore: *Orders and Unity*, p. 184.

of a democratic state. Bishop Cranston of the Methodist Church recently gave a brief statement of his reasons for opposing the Papal Hierarchy in terms which would commend themselves to most of our fellow-citizens:

“First—The American form of government was from the outset a protest against the assumed divine right of kings and emperors to rule their fellow-men. In that sense it is, as against the ancient order, a protesting or protestant form of government.

“Second—The Protestant Church stands for the same essential spirit in its protest against the assumed divine right of the Pontiff of Rome to rule over and direct the spiritual affairs of the world.

“Third—Papacy is religious monarchy, claiming universal dominion and the power to dispose of the souls and bodies of men by its own standards. Protestantism is spiritual democracy, declaring the right of every man to choose his own beliefs and such church-order as suits him best.

“Fourth—The issue just joined is not sectarian, unless the principles of civil and religious liberty embodied in our American Constitution are sectarian. We believe that the rights of the people are God-given, and that all subversive claims are to be classed as sectarian and heretical, because they are in violation of Divine order.”

These reasons as conclusively condemn Episcopacy as Papacy. The latter may be monarchy and the former oligarchy; but both assume authority by Divine sanction, and claim obedience as representing

a transmitted authority, which does not assume that the only "God-given" authority is to be found in "the rights of the people," nor that "every man is to choose his own beliefs and such church-order as suits him best." Or, to put it differently, though there be clear recognition that the democratic principle has its place, and that the rendering of obedience to ecclesiastical authority is a voluntary act, nevertheless authority is claimed by virtue not of popular election but of official heredity. Any form of transmitted authority in the Church clashes with certain ideals of modern democracy.

The principle is attacked also from the side of scientific criticism. On many sides there are scholars who read into the history of the early Church either Congregationalism or Anarchy. Some claim that the earliest ministry derived all authority from popular election; that after the Apostles there was pure democracy in the Church; others like Sohm, that there was no government among primitive Christians at all; but that the introduction of this represents the perversion of original institutions. Criticism is, therefore, claimed as ally of modern spirit and American exigencies to prove the necessity of receding from the position implied in Anglican formularies and canons, and expressly asserted in the fourth section of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral. The Church is asked to reconsider its traditional position, and to admit that the Historic Episcopate is not rightly classed with Scriptures, Creeds, and Sacraments, on the ground that it is now clear, both from signs of the times and from latest investiga-

tions into Christian origins, that episcopacy is not essential to the Christian structure, but is merely an ancient accident of its historic development.

There has always been a party in the Anglican Communion which disbelieved in Apostolic Succession; and it is now strongly urged upon us that the contention of this party has been completely vindicated, that there should be clear recognition that the matter of Orders is not one of essentials. The Historic Episcopate must be put into the category with the Papacy and the Patriarchates, a human device which has had, and has, temporary usefulness, yet is no part of the original Christian deposit. It cannot be made a condition of unity, since it is not of Divine, but of human, origin. This argument is strong and plausible; and no deep thinker or earnest worker can ignore or disparage it. If the facts be as it states, the conclusions drawn are irresistible.

The principle which underlies this contention—namely, that we must distinguish between essentials and non-essentials and place in the former category only what can claim Divine sanction—is unmistakably true. It represents one of the chief contentions of Anglicanism. We are bound by our own special principles to exhibit this discrimination. If the Historic Episcopate does not represent something of our Lord's institution, it has no right to the place given it in the Quadrilateral, and the sooner it is displaced the better. If it be of mere human devising, it makes no difference by what generation of men it was devised. Long continuance and prescription by cus-

tom do not differentiate it from any other system having similar origin. Inventions of the Reformers or of men back of the Reformers, or even of the Apostles, if they acted simply of their own motion, have no more claim on our allegiance from the standpoint of principle than any invention which we might make ourselves. Many social and legal arrangements in the Church have served useful purposes in their time, and serve them still; but, notwithstanding our respect for their utilitarian value, we cannot treat them as in any way essential to the preservation of the Christian Church. The system of Patriarchates in the Roman Empire was such an arrangement; the Papacy was such an arrangement in feudal society, where it served in an age of disintegration to maintain the claims of moral principle over brute force in a way served by no other power for centuries; it still serves to bind together a great portion of the Christian world in a way in which nothing else at this time would bind them; the Methodist "Episcopate" has performed a function of unique usefulness in guiding one of the greatest Christian forces in our land. But all these organised systems of church-government were devised and set at work by men in ways of which we have full knowledge. If what we call "the Historic Episcopate" had a similar origin, we have no right to urge it as a condition of unity. We have no right to add to our Lord's terms of union; the Church must be kept as broad as He made it. We cannot say to those who abandon historic Orders: "Do take our Bishops. They are very ancient and very con-

OLD TESTAMENT

LIBRARY

venient." It is sufficient to reply to such an appeal, "We prefer modern conveniences!" There is no conclusiveness in an argument from mere utilitarian antiquity. Unless the Historic Episcopate represent something which has its origin in a Divine command, we have laid unjustified stress upon it. We can only approach those who believe in our Lord, and are devoted to His service, with an appeal for recognition of what comes to them from our Lord Himself. In our own name we can claim nothing; in His Name we can claim and gain everything. But unless we can speak in His Name, we must be silent.

We are in a difficulty because our Church has defined as essential to Christianity something in regard to which her own mind is not wholly clear, as to whether it represents an institution of our Lord or not. She is, therefore, at fault, either in the position she has assumed, or the reasons which are implied for assuming it. If we are to deal with this difficulty, which is made for us, and clamours for speedy solution, we must consider various questions of fact, past and present, facts concerning the beginnings of Christianity and facts concerning the present needs of Christendom. We are bound to clarify our convictions in regard to the inherent principles of the New Testament Church, the relation of Church authority to the modern spirit, and the actual religious conditions of the world to-day. Until there be serious discussion of these and kindred problems—discussion more serious than we are in the habit of undertaking—we cannot expect to make genuine advance toward the goal of our hope.

Our attitude toward the Principle of Orders, and toward the relation of Orders to Unity, is generally one of impatience or even of suspicion. We have tried for the sake of peace and harmony to keep it in the background, wishing neither to quarrel with the institutions of our own Church nor to be disagreeable to our neighbours. Without denying the correctness of our theoretical position, we have quietly abolished the emphasis our ancestors gave to the principle of the Succession, avoiding both discussion of it in public and consideration of it in private. The Episcopal Church is theoretically the defender, as well as the maintainer, of the Episcopate; but comparatively few of us have made sober effort to see the relation between the principle of the Episcopate and the needs of Christianity in the present day, or the fundamental needs of human nature, or the original institutions of the Gospel. All this must be done, if we are to perpetuate the teaching of our Church, and not promptly to own that in this matter our sense of proportion has been at fault. Indifference is no longer possible. We must believe less than we have concerning our ministry, or we must believe more; and in either case we must know what it is we believe, and why it is that we believe it. Moreover, having clear convictions, we are bound to maintain them; because either way they have bearings of immense practical importance upon crying needs of the time. The popular cry in quarters from which we hear most is, "Believe less; study history, past and present; and own your mistakes." The alternative of believing less is the

one which is just now receiving the more vigorous championship; but there is much to be said for the other alternative.

2

If we are not to believe less than we have done concerning that which we call the Historic Episcopate, we are bound to believe a great deal more. If we choose this alternative, it will be because we have come to see more clearly than we now do: (1) that "Historic Episcopate" implies more than it asserts; (2) that it has its source in a Divine command or ordinance; (3) that it is congruous to essential needs of religious humanity; and (4) that the evidence of history illustrates the truth of the principle involved. The comments made in this paper will have chiefly to do with considerations related to the first two of these four points. At the risk of seeming to abandon the real world for an imaginary, the paper will deal not so much with facts as with presuppositions, since these latter are of prior importance.

All evidence comprises two distinct things, that which establishes antecedent probability, and testimony which shows antecedent probability to have been a fact. No evidence of the second sort has weight in absence of evidence of the first. No testimony can establish an antecedently incredible fact. It will always be more likely that any number of witnesses were mistaken than that there was any occurrence of the impossible. It is often necessary to discard testimony which, upon internal grounds,

is plainly untrustworthy; and those whose preconceptions preclude acceptance of any given fact are quite right in rejecting testimony which contradicts these. They only act upon a principle which governs all rational action. Difficulties in regard to testimony must yield to the paramount claims of presuppositions. Until these are determined, the testimony cannot be fairly examined. In discussions concerning the constitution of the Church, more often than not difference of opinion is due not so much to difficulty in discovering matters of fact, or of discerning their significance, as to differences in fundamental assumption. Until we can agree as to assumptions, or at least can understand what our respective assumptions are, we are not in position to consider the bearing of what appears on the surface of history. In all historical discussions a study of backgrounds is necessary as a beginning; and in discussion of Christian problems there must always be reversion to Christology. If the presupposition that the commonplaces of ordinary life afford full criteria for testing the early Church be a true one, any testimony to a mystical element in its life may be brushed aside. If, on the other hand, the presupposition of a mystical presence of Christ in the Church be a true one, testimony as to the existence of the mystical may be accepted. In discussing the question of Orders it is of prime necessity that we establish at the outset the presuppositions that constitute points of approach. In regard to the Episcopate, presuppositions will relate immediately to the ministry, of which the Episcopate forms a part; be-

yond that, to the Church, of which the ministry is representative; and ultimately to the Person of the one Lord, who is the Head of the Church.

Whether we believe less or more of the Historic Episcopate, it would seem clear that from either standpoint too much importance has been attached to Bishops. If their office be not of Divine appointment, allusion to it in the list of Christian essentials is out of place; if it is of Divine appointment, this can only be demonstrated by showing that the episcopate is one detail in the general system of the ministry and the Church. It has no isolated importance. Its value is due to its context; and it is this context which may claim place among Christian essentials.

The term "Historic Episcopate" represents a non-committal attitude toward the principle of Orders; and its use in the Quadrilateral is exposed to criticism from two sides. Either it refers to something which cannot be rightly classed with Scriptures, Creeds, and Sacraments; in which case it should be omitted altogether: or it represents more than it affirms; in which case it should be replaced by some expression not ambiguous. The language represents an intentional compromise, and might well be superseded; not, however, on the ground that it claims more than can be justified at the bar of history, reason, and practical necessity, but because it does not claim enough.

Nothing "historic" has any paramount claim to Christian obedience, unless history carry it back to our Lord Himself. The Historic Episcopate, merely

regarded as an ancient fact, has *ipso facto* no more claim upon allegiance than the historic Papacy, the historic presbyterate of Calvinism, or the historic "episcopate" of Methodism. All these have served useful purposes and can claim reverence from comparatively long continuance. A device of to-day with sufficient good points to ensure survival would soon become "historic." Origin in the thirteenth century, or in the sixth, can claim no intrinsic superiority over origin in the twentieth; nor for that matter can origin in the second century or the first, unless in the latter case the origin be in an institution of our Lord. If "historic" have serious import, it connotes Divine appointment. If "Historic Episcopate" have right to its place, it means all that is implied in Apostolic Succession and more. "Historic Apostolate" might be a better term, as more clearly suggesting the implied claim of Divine origin. No one doubts that our Lord instituted a body of Apostles; and, if the Episcopate means anything of importance, it indicates the extension of the principle of apostolacy. It can only be justified, if its principle inhere in that of the New Testament Church.

And if "historic" is an ambiguous term, "episcopate" is too narrow. Whatever claim is made for the episcopate applies also to the other orders of the ministry. The Russian Church is more logical than the Anglican when, in defining in her Catechism the principle of Orders, she makes no isolated reference to Bishops, but speaks of the Ministry as a whole:

“Q. What ecclesiastical institution is there through which the succession of the apostolical ministry is preserved?

“A. The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy.

“Q. Whence originates the Hierarchy of the Orthodox Christian Church?

“A. From Jesus Christ Himself, and from the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles; from which time it is continued in unbroken succession through the laying on of hands in the Sacrament of Orders. *And He gave some apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ.*”

Moreover, whatever claim is made for the Ministry is made for the Church as a whole. The question of the form of the Ministry must be merged in the principle of the Ministry, which must be related directly to the principle of the Church. If the Ministry have a Divine commission, it is because the Church has a Divine commission; and if the Ministry be now used as instruments for the Divine activity of the ascended Christ, it is because the power of the Ascended Christ fills that whole Church, which is “a royal priesthood” working for Him. The Church of to-day, and the apostolate of to-day, must be regarded as inspired in the same way as their primitive prototypes. “Historic Episcopate,” rationally interpreted, means “Historic Ministry” in the widest sense; this, logically resolved, must be

interpreted as "Historic Church"; and "Historic Church," if it be of essential importance, means Divinely-appointed Church. Had the Lambeth fathers coupled "Historic Church" with Scriptures, Creeds, and Sacraments it would have been more clear why their Quadrilateral should not have been left a Triangle. The fourth essential principle is the Church principle, if it is anything at all. It claims for Christianity the principle of all social order and growth, *corporate organisation*; and it can be justified, if the corporate principle can be shown to inhere in religion, as well as in Christianity.

Consideration of a corporate body, and of its government, must involve consideration of the character of its life. The principle of authority cannot be severed from its context. The Church as a whole is a Spirit-bearing body; and its life consists of vital contact with God. The difference between the Historic Church (using this term in reference to the Church of the first days) and other churches is that the Historic Church kept alive the principle of mysticism corporately expressed. The chief rites of the Church were its Sacraments; and the ministry, as functional for, and representative of, the whole laity of God, had a sacramental character, and might appropriately expect a sacramental commission.

Thus interpreted, the fourth section of the Quadrilateral is a necessary sequence of the third. A sacramental Church requires a sacramental Ministry; an apostolic Church, a perpetual Apostolate; a mystical life, a mystical social expression. If the

Church be of Divine origin, and aim at making men "partakers of the Divine nature," there is place for an apostolate Divinely commissioned. Moreover, the mystical Church with its mystical life is necessary and natural consequence of the Divinity of its Head. The historical conception of the Church follows from the historical interpretation of the meaning of the life of Christ; in other words, from the theology of the Creeds. As the fourth section of the Quadrilateral depends directly upon the third, so the third depends directly upon the second. The Divine Christ draws to Himself a Divinely-inspired Church, and to sustain this maintains a Divinely-commissioned Ministry. All these principles depend upon the first, the authority of Holy Scripture. Historic Christianity is the religion of the New Testament. The ultimate meaning of "historic" in such contexts as these is as synonym for "Scriptural." "Historic Episcopate," raised to its highest terms, is equivalent to "Scriptural Church."

Some forms of Christianity have deliberately, and some unconsciously, abandoned New Testament conceptions; but the only Christianity which can long hold serious attention is the faith attested by the original records, the faith which as matter of fact has dominated the ages, the historic belief in the Incarnation of the Son of God. If this original record be unauthoritative or misleading, the Christian religion has been lost beyond reclaim. No critical ingenuity or poetic aspiration can recover what has left no certain trace. In these days of many "new Christianities" we are slow in appre-

hending that after all the old Christianity—based on the only trustworthy evidence we possess—is the only one which has enough to say for itself to make a plausible appeal to the profound thought of the future.

But, assuming the substantial accuracy of the New Testament—and this is the first presupposition of Anglican Christianity,—it is possible to have a conception and theory of Christ, a conception and theory of His Church, and a conception and theory of that Church's ministry. These conceptions are all mystical. They are contrasted with all other conceptions which, no matter how philosophical or philanthropic, reject the mystical and the supernatural in all their forms. The mystical sequence begins with the Person of the Word of God incarnate, presented in the inspired Scriptures, the substance of which is briefly summarised in the ancient Creeds; still sacramentally active in His inspired Church, the permanence and coherence of which is guaranteed by a perpetual apostolate.

These ideas may be illustrated from the language of St. Paul, St. John, and our Lord Himself. The doctrine of the Church in the Epistle to the Ephesians is but the counterpart and corollary of the doctrine of Christ in the Epistle to the Colossians; the assertions of mystical relation and communion in St. John's First Epistle are the natural outcome of the theology of the Prologue to his Gospel and of the conception of the Son of Man expressed in the imagery of the Apocalypse. Our Lord promises to build His Church upon faith which recognises Him

as "the Christ, the Son of the Living God," and affirms a spiritual connection between Himself and His disciples analogous to the connection between branches with the stock of a vine. It is consistent with the idea of mystical indwelling that the Church should receive a mystical commission; and this, according to St. John's narrative, was a fact. "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when He had so said, He showed them His hands and His side. Then were they glad when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus unto them, Peace be unto you; as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained."

The mission of the Apostles is here associated with the mission of the Divine Son. It is related to the realm of the mysterious and supernatural. As coming from God incarnate, risen from the dead, there is nothing surprising in a mystical mission of men set apart for a mystical purpose. A Divine Being, sending a body of men into the world for the sake of forgiving and retaining sins, might be expected to inaugurate their work in some supernatural way. Nothing is natural for a supernatural purpose but a supernatural method. Moreover, men commissioned to discharge spiritual functions of necessity require spiritual credentials. If the Head of the

Christian Church be God, supernaturally active to effect the conversion of men to Himself, He may be expected to work in human society in superhuman ways; and His method of ruling and perpetuating His Church is of necessity a method appropriate not to men but to God.

The question inevitably arises, Can God safely depute His authority to rule to men? A negative answer is the easier to give. But there is an important analogy which calls for pause. The first function which we concede in our thought to God is creation. The question may be asked: "Can, or does, God depute His creative function to men? Is it conceivable that He should do this, or, if so, that the results should not be disastrous?" He *does* do this; and the results *are* disastrous; and yet, in spite of the anomaly, we believe in God as Father, and as Maker of heaven and earth. We should not of ourselves expect that Divine creation would be put into commission; but, since we see it, we can raise no theoretical objection to redemption and sanctification put into commission. We can say of nothing that God must work in any specified way; but analogies help to remove difficulties, not by explaining what lies beyond our present comprehension, but by suggesting that in parallel cases we do not find them insuperable.

We have not gone to the bottom of our difficulties over ecclesiastical questions until we see that they resolve themselves into questions of Christology or Theology. The fundamental question is, "What think ye of Christ?" If the answer we make is that

of St. Thomas, "My Lord and my God," then our attitude will be like Thomas', and we shall have no difficulty in accepting on our Lord's authority the idea of a mystical Church with a mystical apostolate mystically connected with the Divine King. We are at fault if we think of the Church solely in terms of ordinary social institutions. Our thought of it must take constant account of Him Who rules over and through it.

The links in historical testimony for a ministry tracing to Christ, and having mystical authority, are sufficient to establish the fact for any one who considers hereditary transmission of Divine authority antecedently credible. It is only by doing violence to testimony of a varied and conclusive character that the principle of transmissible authority can be read out of the New Testament; and only by similar violence that the extension of this principle can be banished from the sub-apostolic age. Violence is justifiable if the facts attested or suggested are of an improbable character; but in this case the facts are not improbable to those who have already made the assumptions, and the inductions, which make possible a belief in the Incarnation of the Son of God. If the principle of the ministry be established, it will not be by quotations from Clement and Ignatius, no matter how conclusive these appear, but by demonstration that the ministerial principle inheres in the fundamental principle of all. Sacraments and Apostolic Succession may be accepted, if the external evidence demand, by those who believe in the Divinity of Christ. They may and must be

rejected by those who cannot accept this. The crux lies there. The difficulties about them are in ultimate analysis difficulties with the Incarnation doctrine itself. In the great crises of the Church's history the dividing-line has always been between those who vitally believed, and those who practically disbelieved, in the doctrine of the Incarnation. The same thing is true now. Below all lesser differences between professing Christians of every name and degree is the basal distinction between those who do, and those who do not, apprehend what is meant by the Divinity of Christ.

It is by no means true that all who reject the historic ministry and mystical conception of the Church reject also the Divinity of our Lord. Some of the most profound believers in, and defenders of, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity are to be found among those who have abandoned the historic Church. It is true, however, that modern Church history shows a constant association of rejection of the historic Church with rejection of the historic theology; and that objections to the one are usually based on principles which apply equally to the other. The special point here urged is that those who have made the presuppositions necessary for belief in the Incarnation have made also the presuppositions necessary for belief in a mystical and sacramental Church. It does not follow that they will at once accept the historic ministry as inevitable expression of the Church principle; but it does follow that they will have no theoretical objection to it. What they question is not the principle, but the fact.

3

The future is likely to see a closer drawing together in all ways of those who share the fundamental conviction that "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us," and that in Him we have beheld God's Glory; as it is likely also to see a clearer demonstration that many who in form hold to the ancient faith have actually ceased to hold it in practical reality. The number of those who, from the religious standpoint, must be classed as Unitarians, is on the increase. This is a good thing. It means that men are finding their right associations. The great Unitarians have been good examples of people who know where they do, or at any rate where they do not, stand; who are intellectually clear-headed in seeing discrepancies between formal professions and actual convictions, and morally admirable in ceasing to profess what they have ceased in sincerity to hold. Most of them have found it impossible longer to believe in miracle, or to accept the New Testament interpretation of the meaning of the life of Jesus. Yet they treasure the supreme ethical revelation of perfect humanity, as they feel they see it in the Gospels, as an inspiring though unrealised ideal. They lay great stress on the fundamental postulate of the Fatherhood of God; and uphold lofty ideals of intellectual honesty, philanthropy, and culture. This is not an ignoble religion, though it is a difficult one; since they are seeking to live up to "our profession, which is to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be

made like unto Him," without support of the belief which alone sanctions acceptance of His authority, and which offers promise that aspirations to be like Him can be realised. It represents a more stupendous venture of faith than is exhibited by those who accept the New Testament grounds for making the venture; and for this reason it has a pathetic moral grandeur, but more and more does it become dogmatically indefinite.

Unitarians scrupulously avoid committing themselves to more than a few generalities, leave room for all varieties of opinions and practice, and profess no form of organisation other than temporary association for convenience. Dr. Martineau once wrote to a friend:¹ "There is no such denomination as 'the Unitarian body'; if there was, I should not for an hour belong to it. There are a number of worshipping societies in which the majority, or the whole, of the members—it may be permanently, it may be for a time—have ceased to be Trinitarian; but the extent of their deviation from the old theology is of every variety; and it is wholly undefined by accepted or unaccepted formulæ and is in no sense, beyond that of natural sympathy, a condition of membership or communion." In other words, it is permissible to believe a great deal, so long as fulness of faith is regarded merely as individual privilege or idiosyncrasy; it is permissible to believe little or nothing, so long as one does not negatively dogmatise. The one principle is that of studious vague-

¹ William Knight, *Inter Amicos*.

ness; and an indefinite hope is studiously kept aloof from any sort of supernatural sanction. Most Unitarians consistently hold to this undogmatic position; and it is they only who are true representatives of an undogmatic or undenominational religion.

The religion of the Gospels, on the contrary, is definite. It affirms that the instinctive hopes of humanity have found corroboration in historic events, and appeals to these as grounds for confidence, and as exemplars for thought and will. Men wish to believe in God as Love. The relentless course of the physical universe, and the disorder in the moral universe, seem to deny the wish. Christianity points to a definite fact as support for this natural craving. "*In this was the love of God manifested that He gave His only-begotten Son.*" Men wish to see some explanation of the problem of pain. "*He suffered and was buried.*" They wish to believe in immortality. "*On the third day He rose again from the dead.*" So for the whole round of its dogmas. The historic religion, which has been responsible for the great historic consequences, springs directly from historic facts. To abandon these facts is to abandon the foundation of actual Christianity, and to revert from positive dogmas of hope to negative dogmas which, if scrutinised, preclude hope. The religion of the Gospels, however conscious of limitation from the fact that "now we see through a glass darkly," asserts that for definite reasons in past history and present experience we have definite beliefs and expectations. "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding

that we may know Him that is true, and that we are in Him that is true, even in His Son, Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." These definite beliefs, based on definite grounds, are capable of definite statement, such as is given in the Creeds, and susceptible of definite application, such as is given in the Sacraments and Ministry of the Church. A degree of definiteness is everywhere characteristic of Gospel Christianity; and to avoid definiteness in belief and statement is to repudiate a Christian quality. Much harm has been done by carrying the desire for definiteness too far, by striving to be wise beyond what is written, and by dogmatising upon insufficient grounds. There is, however, a contrary danger to which we are more exposed, of ignoring conclusions which may unhesitatingly be derived from our accepted premises.

Dr. Fairbairn once said in commenting on the controversies of the fifth century, "The Nestorian Christ is the natural Saviour of the Pelagian man." The two heresies dovetailed. The Pelagian man is one who by his innate powers is perfectly able to work out his own salvation without intervention of Divine grace. For such a man a perfect human example is a helpful stimulus; and in his youth he needs a teacher: but he stands in no need of the sort of spiritual sustenance which is implied in Christian sacraments. The Nestorian Christ is merely the greatest of the prophets, teaching with special authority from God and showing by His life what human nature can and ought to be. It is natural, therefore, for any one whose doctrine of humanity

is that of Pelagius to hold a Christology which is practically that of Nestorius. To one who feels no need, and sees no need, of a Divine Redeemer the unnecessary is also the incredible; and with perfect consistency he can follow Nestorius rather than St. Paul or St. John. A merely human teacher is all that is needed by a self-sufficient humanity. These forms of thought perpetually recur in new guises. Those who exalt the possibilities of human nature indefinitely, see no need of the Incarnation of God, either for purposes of revelation or for purposes of salvation. They, therefore, reject the salient features of the Gospel, although willing to retain some features of the Gospel story for their noble associations and their helpful suggestiveness. But the root of repudiation of the old doctrine lies in inability to feel man's dependence upon Divine grace.

Our theories of our own nature and of our personal relation to God determine our theories concerning Christ; and they also, both directly and reflexively, determine our theories concerning the Church. The Pelagian man is the natural organiser of congregational churches: that is, voluntary associations of men, free to choose such beliefs and church-order as they see fit; and, moreover, these congregational churches are the only organisations that are needed for the propagation of faith in a Nestorian or Unitarian Christ. Modern democratic and critical methods may deal as they choose with an ancient prophet and philanthropist; and if this be an exhaustive description of Jesus Christ, our churches need only be such societies as we see fit to form

from time to time for the purpose of discussing or applying any part of His teaching. Lowell, in the *Biglow Papers*, gives an apt illustration of the attitude toward the Gospel, which may rightly be assumed from the standpoint of mere humanitarian doctrine:

“ Parson Wilbur says *he* never heard in his life
That apostles, rigged up in their swaller-tailed coats,
Marched around at the back of a drum and fife,
Some looking for office, and others for votes ;
But John P.
Robinson, *he*
Says they didn’t know everything down in Judee.”

Mr. Robinson’s attitude is perfectly justified if the Apostles were merely fellow-citizens whom he would have met on an equality, and have given fair play, in a town-meeting; and whose leader himself could have claimed no other footing, even though his character and reputation were such as to mark him out for the chairmanship of important committees. If Jesus Christ were only on a par with John the Baptist, Jeremias, and other of the prophets, we can only regard him as a venerable figure in the past who must of necessity yield to men of the present.

But it is all changed if our presupposition be that of St. Peter, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.” That presupposition of faith in His Godhead gives foundation for a Church of entirely different character. To one who has mystical conceptions of our Lord’s Person and his own nature, the mystical Church with its mystical life and rites

is not only a possibility but a necessity. Robert E. Speer has said somewhere that "our loyalty to the mission is the measure of our judgment of the Son of God." That exactly illustrates the principle. Our loyalty to the Church which discharges the great missionary responsibility, and to the ministry which forms an integral part of that Church, is measured by the judgment we make of Him who is the Church's Head. The special point here urged is that *doctrine of the Church, and policies for the Church, have inevitably a Theological context*. From this they cannot be separated; and this it is which gives them distinctive character. In discussions concerning the Church this context must always be involved; and any consideration which ignores it is bound to be superficial.

We stand at a parting of ways with strong inducements to follow either path. There is a persuasive claim that the primitive form of Christianity is no longer tenable; that the religion of the future must cut adrift from obsolete forms of thought and practice, which prevent its progress. Strong reasons are alleged to support the position. A mighty tendency in modern life is forging further and further away from any serious regard for the miraculous; and the New Testament has no message of much import for those who yield to it. There is a mighty appeal in the call to break with a cramping past and throw oneself blindly but hopefully into what claims for itself the future. On the other hand, there are those who see that the only Christianity which can long survive is the earliest of all, which

still has for them its ancient spell; and who believe that the simple principles of early days are to receive stronger and clearer expression. It seems not unlikely that lesser lines of division between Christians will become obscured; and that those who bear the name will gravitate more and more into two great camps: on the one side those who hold tenaciously to the apostolic norm; on the other, those who make only eclectic use of Gospel teaching for illustration of a composite religion, which affirms but a few basal truths, and yet ranges widely in its effort to draw from all the wisdom of the world. If this happen, it will be evident that, both in pre-suppositions and in conclusions, the two parties are poles asunder.

The immediate future is likely to demonstrate in which direction our own Church is moving; and that move one way or the other it must. It occupies a middle position in Christendom, and hopes to use this position to mediate for unity. In our desire to show "malice toward none and charity for all," we have been loth to emphasise differences. We have gloried in our duality to the very verge of duplicity; we have habitually halted between two opinions, and have shown unmistakable symptoms of the ailment of Laodiceæ. Yet we must declare ourselves plainly, if we be challenged to choose between the old and a new not akin to the old. A choice not only of critical, but of vital, importance lies before us in the consideration of what we believe, what we maintain, and what we abandon, in our theories of the Christian ministry; for belief about Orders involves

belief about Sacraments; and belief about Sacraments, belief about the Church; and that belief resolves itself into the answer we give to the one decisive, discriminating question of questions: "What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He?"

**THE ACHIEVEMENTS AND
FAILURES OF PROTESTANTISM**

V

THE ACHIEVEMENTS AND FAILURES OF PROTESTANTISM ¹

THE positive strength of the religious movement known as the Protestant Reformation lies in its insistence on religious individualism. This principle was taught in the first stage of the evolution of revealed religion, which culminated in the Incarnation of the Son of God. This, it appears, gives special significance to the call and training of Abraham. "At the beginning of the history of religion in the Bible, a history in which men were to be variously dealt with, as corporate societies as well as individual persons, in its front and on its threshold, is the type and figure of the religious man. Abraham was to be the example to us all, the great instance of that faith without which there can be no communion between man and his God, the faith which realises God, and what God is. . . . This is the first lesson of the masters of the spiritual life. This

¹ The name "Protestantism" is used in its most general sense, as synonym for the general influence which has determined the character and history both of those aspects of religious development which may be traced directly to the Reformation and of others strongly, though less directly, affected by it.

is the first awakening to the reality of religion, when it comes to us in our heart of hearts, in the certainties of conscience, that in spite of all that fills the eye and is not ourselves, there *is* ourself, and there *is* God; 'God *is* God, and I am I;' and 'we begin by degrees,' as it has been said, 'to perceive that there are but two beings in the whole universe—two only supreme and luminously self-evident beings—our own soul, and the God Who made it.'"¹

That first lesson of religion had not been forgotten, but had been woefully obscured, by the Christian Church in the later Middle Ages. The Church and Church system were popularly regarded as beginning and end of everything; and to yield unquestioning obedience to established ecclesiastical conventions was all that was required or desired. Quite apart from abuses in the existing system, there was lack of proportion in things religious; the corporate

¹ Church: *Discipline of the Christian Character*, pp. 18-21. "At the beginning of the history of the religion of the Bible, a history in which men were to be variously dealt with, as corporate societies as well as individual persons, in its front and on its threshold, is the type and figure of the religious man. Abraham was to be the example to us all, the great instance of that faith, without which there can be no communion between man and his God, the faith which realises God, and what God is. Abraham stands before us in the Old Testament and in the New as 'the friend of God.' Abraham stands before us equally in both as the 'father of us all.' Of him was spoken by the mouth of Jesus Christ that mysterious praise, 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day, and he saw it and was glad.' And his history is marked as the history of a man, a soul, by itself in relation to Almighty God; not as one of a company, a favoured brotherhood, or chosen body, but in all

principle had crushed and stifled the individual principle; the Church on earth was largely regarded as an end in itself, rather than as appointed means of bringing souls in touch with God. Popular religion had resolved itself into externalism. Religious thought was shallow; morality was superficial. Even in those quarters in which men were trying most zealously to serve God, there was little more than a correct ecclesiasticism, which had lost all apprehension of the sort of spiritual struggle and stern earnestness which made the life of the prophets or of St. Paul. The highest types of religious development, ethical and intellectual,—and there were very high and admirable examples,—fell obviously short of the types discoverable in the New Testament and in the earlier ages of the Church. It is not true that the Church was wholly and hopelessly corrupt; it is not true that Christianity was dead: it *is* true

his doings single and alone, alone with the Alone, one with One, with his Maker, as he was born, and as he dies, alone: the individual soul, standing all by itself, in the presence of its Author and Sustainer, called by Him and answering to His call, choosing, acting, obeying, from the last depths and secrets of its being; feeling, confessing His awful and unsearchable righteousness. . . . Thus early was laid the foundation of the religious character, the character which was to grow up into 'the mind of Christ.' In our mysterious being we have a double existence; we are part of a body, and God deals with men collectively as communities; yet also we are as much single spirits as if we were alone in the world, each running separately and apart his individual course. To teach men from the first the awful, the difficult truth, that they have each of them a soul—this was the meaning of that discipline of Abraham and the Patriarchs; and the whole history

that there was widespread deterioration, and that Christianity was deadly dull. The general fault was that the Church had drifted away from the truth that religion means personal consciousness of God, that Christianity means personal union with Christ, that membership in Christ's Church is intended to deepen the sense of needing personal conversion, and must issue in personal holiness. Too much had the Church and Church system been made a substitute for the Person and direct activities of our Lord; so that what was designed to bring closest union with Him was so used as to be a sort of barrier. What was most needed was a revival of individual, personal faith. This was precisely what the Protestant Reformation sought to bring. Luther was not the only one who believed in the crying need of teaching Justification by Faith. Cardinal Reginald Pole writing to Cardinal Contarini, who had emphasised

of religion has shown how necessary it was. The visible world is all about us, early and late, wrapping us round, occupying eye and thought and desire; we seem to belong to it, and to it alone; it seems as if we must take our chance with it. And on the other hand we know how easily men come to think that being one of a body—even though it were the 'seed of Abraham,' or 'the Church of Christ'—makes it less necessary to remember their personal singleness, their personal responsibility. To belong to a good set, to a religious family, seems to give us a security for ourselves; insensibly, perhaps, we take to ourselves credit for the goodness of our friends; we look at ourselves as if we must be what they are. The soul has indeed to think and to work with others, and for others, and for great aims and purposes, out of and beyond itself. *For* others and *with* others the best part of its earthly work is done. But, first, the soul has to know that sublime truth about itself: that

this same doctrine in his letters, said, "You have brought to light the jewel which the Church hath kept half-concealed." Nor was Luther the only one who thought that the Church could no longer be brought to a proper sense of what its faith should be in constitutional and conventional ways. A Dominican monk, writing about the time of Luther's birth, expressed an opinion not uncommon among serious-minded people: "The world cries for a Council; but how can one be obtained in the present condition of the heads of the Church? No human power avails any longer to reform the Church through a Council. God Himself must come to our aid in some way now unknown to us."

The Protestant Reformation was a revolution; but it came at a time when only revolutionary methods would accomplish necessary results. It succeeded in gaining new recognition of the principle of faith;

it stands before the Everlasting by itself, and for what it is. Abraham learned it, like Moses, like Elijah, like Isaiah, like St. Paul; in Job and the Psalter we see the early fruits of that discipline. The soul knew itself alone with God; no words could tell the incommunicable secret of the presence of God; and in that secret was wrapped up the seed of its conviction of its own mysterious immortality—"God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." This is the first lesson of the masters of the spiritual life. This is the first awakening to the reality of religion, when it comes to us in our heart of hearts, in the certainties of conscience, that in spite of all that fills the eye and is not ourselves, there *is* ourself, and there *is* God; 'God is God, and I am I'; and 'we begin by degrees,' as it has been said, 'to perceive that there are but two beings in the whole universe—two only supreme and luminously self-evident beings—our own soul and the God who made it.'"

but from the beginning this religious individualism followed two lines of development, which were always distinct and often in conflict, Evangelicalism and Rationalism. They were combined in Luther. Both had positive force and needed fresh recognition; both were susceptible of one-sided expression and received it. The evangelical principle is merely the prime requisite of individual conversion to God, faith resulting in personal piety and devotion, the cultivation of the individual conscience, and its protection from ecclesiastical, or other social, tyranny. It is the old lesson of becoming conscious of God and myself. The rationalistic principle is on its positive side, primarily, the necessity of individual apprehension of religious truth, and, secondarily, the necessity of testing Christian truth by constant reference to its Source. Tradition must be tested by reference to final authority. Christianity can only be kept pure by conformity to the New Testament norm. In the sixteenth century there was much provocation to revolt from an unwarranted dogmatism. There was need not only of teaching justifying faith, but also of emphasising the unique authority of the Christian Scriptures.

In teaching Faith and the Bible the Protestant Reformers did useful and necessary work. They proclaimed noble and truly Christian ideals. Luther's ideal of the sinful soul clinging simply to the Cross is humanly and Scripturally true; the Puritan ideal of the sturdy God-fearing man fashioning his life after the Scriptural pattern is truly Christian; the ideal of resolute adherence to Gospel

simplicities in defiance of disguising ecclesiastical traditions represents a constitutional principle of the Church of the first days. On the whole, the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century was beneficial. It may easily be shown that the strongest forces in Christianity to-day are directly, or indirectly, due to its influence. It has produced the most virile types of religion in the modern world; and it has by lateral pressure and reaction effected beneficial changes in the religious systems which it sought to supersede. It has contributed largely to the vigour and happiness of the peoples who have been nurtured by it by infusing a new enthusiasm for human life. This has been true even among Calvinists, whose practical efforts to secure solid comfort have never conformed to the discomfort of their professed principles. It is always necessary to consider the general tendencies, as distinct from the formed theories, of any movement in order to estimate its influence and the reasons for its appeal to popular enthusiasm. There are two tendencies characteristic of the Protestant Reformation which go far to explain its power. The first is its humanitarian tendency, which appealed strongly to the common-sense of Germany; and the second, more prominently developed in the history of Calvinism, its encouragement of the spirit of democracy.

As against monastic ideals, which disparaged and held aloof from common life and the enjoyment of life's good things, Protestantism, especially in its Lutheran form, exalted an ideal of homely domestic purity and happiness. As Dr. Jacobs has

noted, "the prevalent character of the Christian life nourished by the Lutheran faith is humble, devout, unobtrusive, joyous, buoyant. All good things of this life that come according to God's calling and in His order are gratefully received and cheerfully used, in order that God may be glorified in the Christian's enjoyment of temporal as well as spiritual things." The ideal of a comfortable and cheerful religion appealed not only to the spirit which shirked the rigours of discipline, but also to the fundamental consciousness of human nature that it is God-given and God-like, not to be treated as wholly sinful and worthless, as monasticism seemed to imply. There was a discrepancy between Protestant theory and Protestant practice. Lutheranism no less than Calvinism taught the doctrine of the total depravity of human nature in an extreme form. As against the unnaturalness of Protestant doctrine concerning man, the scholastic doctrine and refined culture of fifteenth-century monasteries offered refreshing contrasts. Yet in spite of this is it true that the general influence of Protestantism tended to exalt conceptions of the beauty and holiness of ordinary human life and to deepen the religious tone of the home, whereas the general influence of monastic ideals, prevailing in Christendom for well-nigh ten centuries prior to the Reformation, was mainly in the other direction. Thought and practice typically monastic were to a great extent superseded by thought and practice typically domestic. The chief example of change appeared in the advocacy of a married in place of a celibate clergy.

In the second place, insistence on individual right and worth inevitably led to fuller considerations of the rights and worth of individuals belonging to the humbler ranks of society, and gave to these individuals a new sense of their own proper dignity and importance. This naturally led to efforts at social betterment, which have resulted in the great democratic movements of the present epoch. Calvinism in particular has been a great democratic force, and has counted for much in raising the standards of popular education and improvement of the condition of the less-favored classes. The connection of Protestantism and Democracy as mutual cause and effect has been a close one; and the influence and strength of Protestantism are largely accounted for and best explained, when it is accurately related to the modern tendencies which make for popular development and popular self-government. As the characteristic religious product of modern times, it must, to be rightly estimated, be defined in terms of the modern spirit. Not everything modern is the best, nor is everything modern certain long to survive; yet it is reasonable to assume that everything distinctly modern has a good deal to say for itself. As a broad generalisation, it is certainly true that, taken as a whole, Protestantism has been the strongest religious influence active during the last three hundred years.

2

It is not true, however, that it has proven an unmixed blessing; nor is it true that, so far as we can forecast the future, it is certain that it will

dominate the next three centuries as it has the past three. In the nature of things it is time to expect some new revival which will build up itself on the fragments of an obsolescent past. Review of the last age of the Church shows plainly that Protestantism has not been free from radical one-sidedness; nor has its influence been invariably for good. It has had the defects of its virtues, and has had to pay the penal consequences of its vices. Along certain lines it has been manifestly successful; along others it has led to conspicuous failure. Its limitations have been due to unguarded emphasis upon that side of truth which it seemed its special function to teach; and the consequences of the unguarded emphasis have been often disastrous.

1. In the first place, its insistence on the need of individual conversion, individual apprehension of the meaning of union with Christ, has often led to an unbalanced emotionalism. Starting from recognition that genuine Christianity involves direct and conscious response of the living soul to the operation of the Spirit of the Living God, laying hold of the evangelical principle that individual salvation comes by individual faith, it has often identified religion with individual eccentricity in such a way as to caricature and contradict the genuine evangelical spirit. Justification by faith has sometimes been interpreted as justification by hysterics!

In Luther himself first appeared unbalanced statements concerning faith, which distorted the Pauline doctrine of Justification. In his insistence on the primal necessity of faith, he violently repudiated

both "works" and "reason." "It is by faith *sole*," he said, "not by faith perfected by love, that we are justified." Or again: "It is a quality of faith that it wrings the neck of reason, and strangles the beast, which else the whole world with all creatures could not strangle. . . . All faithful men who enter with Abraham the gloom and hidden darkness of faith . . . strangle reason and offer to God the acceptable sacrifice that can ever be brought to him." Or, as Canon Mozley paraphrases some of his language: "Believe that you are absolved, and you are absolved—was his teaching as a priest before he broke from the Church; never mind whether you deserve absolution or no. He that believes is better than he that deserves. Always be sure that you are pleasing God; if you are sure you are, you are. Feel yourself safe; if you feel yourself safe, you are safe." Teaching like this led to several undesirable results. Disparagement of "works" led to antinomianism, which in extreme cases, such as those of the Zwickau Prophets and the Kingdom of the New Jerusalem at Munster, issued in gross and flagrant immorality; disparagement of "reason" led to an irrational emotionalism, which led rational men wholly to despise the religion which it professed to represent; the unnatural divorce between faith and love, motive and acts, has led to anarchy in the realm of ethics, especially in the notorious casuistry of the Jesuits, for which Luther is in large part responsible. "The end justifies the means" is only "justification by faith only" in another form. Mr. Gladstone pointed out that "Jesuitism was only

rendered possible by the Reformation; it was by reflex action the Reformation's child." "The Reformation consisted in bringing into prominence the subjective element in religion in counterpoise to the undue prominence previously given the objective. If the immediate effect of this was to revive personal religion, its ultimate effect was often to exalt consciousness and a good purpose above truth and right action. In the Reformers this showed itself in a readiness to abandon the old faith, and change much that was good through fear of that which was bad, and in extreme cases to make faith a substitute for a holy life; in the Jesuits it led to subtle distinctions and casuistical avoidance of the consequences of truths which they professed to accept. The Jesuit doctrine of 'intention' is well known, and their readiness to do evil that good may come is the logical corollary of that doctrine. They were connected with the Reformation spirit, . . . not indeed as logical and necessary consequence, but as an exaggerated and one-sided development."¹ Antinomianism and emotionalism are different things; but in religious history they have had close connection in cause and in fact. The wild lawlessness of Munster belongs to a different category from the hysterical fervour of negro revivals; yet both have root in an exaggerated emphasis on feeling, which leads emotion to ignore the restraints both of reason and of conscience. Both are results of senseless excitement and are as far as possible from the normal

¹ Moore: *History of the Reformation*, p. 16.

consequences of the exercise of emotion in religion. In all genuine Christianity the heart is touched; but it does not therefore follow that it can dispense with the head. The results of the deepest religious feeling, as illustrated by the lives of those who are the best specimens of Christian discipleship, are humility and soberness. These virtues have not been conspicuously displayed by those whose only religion was Protestantism. They were better exemplified in mediæval monasteries. While it must never be forgotten that apprehension of the evangelical principle is necessary for genuineness in religion; it must also be recognised that its exaggeration has often banished sobriety. It is no dishonour to the general excellence of Reformation influence to note the absurd and immoral excesses to which unbalanced assertion of its principles has sometimes led; but these unpleasant phenomena, existing not only in the past but also in the present, must be fairly considered when we are trying to estimate the value of the movement and to adjust our relation to it.

2. A second consequence of Protestant influence has been the encouragement of unrestrained and destructive rationalism. Emphasis on the function of the intellect in religion has led to exaggeration of its powers, due anomalously to failure to exercise them. One of the most important functions of reason is the recognition of its proper limitations; and if reason is to do its work, it needs restraint and correlation to man's other faculties. In spite of Luther's violent assaults on reason as a possible

rival to faith, to Luther himself may be traced the beginnings of a habit of negative criticism which has in many quarters led to the destruction of all faith. Protestantism has as matter of fact been the parent of unbelief, both by reaction from its rigours and as direct result of a tendency which it has itself fostered. It is a patent fact that Unitarianism and Agnosticism, and occasionally Atheism, have dogged its steps. This has been largely due to revolt from the inhuman dogmas of Calvinistic theology, but also to the Protestant tendency to reduce all truth to the level of individual comprehension and to reject as unnecessary, if not as untrue, anything and everything which made no special appeal to the individual mind. Religious truth has been treated as purely subjective, and reduced to the confines of individual subjectivity.

The process of rationalistic, as distinct from rational, development in the case of Luther was somewhat as follows. Against certain manifest abuses in the Church he quoted the authority of St. Paul. He was reminded that opposition to established usages was virtual repudiation of the authority of the Church as represented in the Pope. This led him explicitly to declare that the supreme and final authority in the Church is not the Pope but Holy Scripture. And this raised at once the question of authoritative interpretation. The Pope had his views of the meaning of Scripture, and quoted Scripture against Luther. Luther would not hear of that. The only interpretation of Scripture he recognised was his own; and this led him to elabo-

rate the doctrine of the sufficiency of private judgment. By this he meant only his own private judgment, since he treated all divergent private judgments in whatever quarter they appeared with indiscriminate denunciation. It was thus that he addressed himself to some of his disciples in Wittenberg: "Satan has been busy during my absence and has sent you some of his prophets. He knows whom to send; but you ought to know too that I am the only person you should listen to. Martin Luther is the first man in the Reformation; others come after him; he therefore should command and you should obey. It is your lot. I am the man to whom God has revealed His Word. I know Satan and am not afraid of him; I have hit him a blow that he will feel for a long time." So also to the Zwickau Prophets, who, declaring that Luther was being converted to their understanding of Scripture, began to cry "The Spirit! the Spirit!" he tersely replied, "I slap your spirit on the snout." Nor did the eminently Scriptural Zwingli please him. "What a fellow is this Zwinglius! ignorant as a block of grammar and logic and every other science. . . . I regard him as having drawn upon himself the hatred of all good men by his daring and criminal manner of teaching the Word of God." All this will compare favourably with his language to the Pope, the scholastic theologians, and Henry VIII; yet it is all directed against those who were at one with him in exalting the authority of Scripture and in adopting his principle of private judgment. His difficulties with the refractory private judgments of

his followers were analogous to those of George Fox, the apostle of "inward light," with the refractory inward lights of some early Quakers. He was obliged to require that other inward lights should be subject to his own!

Moreover, Luther's difficulties were not confined to expositors of Scripture; he encountered difficulties—even opposition—in the Scriptures themselves. And when the Scriptures dared to say things other than what, according to his private judgment, they ought to say, so much the worse for them! Some Apostles he wholly approved of; others he did not. The final criterion of what was apostolic and what was evangelical was nothing more nor less than his own opinion. "Those Apostles who treat oftenest and highest of how faith in Christ alone justifies are the best evangelists. Therefore are Paul's Epistles more a Gospel than Matthew, Mark, and Luke. For these do not set down more than the story of the works and miracles of Christ; but the grace we receive through Christ, no one so boldly extols as Paul, especially in his letter to the Romans." "John's Gospel, Paul's Epistles, especially that to the Romans, and Peter's First Epistle are the right kernel and marrow of all books . . . for in them thou findest written down not many works and miracles of Christ, but in a quite masterly way expounded how faith in Christ overcomes sin and death and hell, and gives life, righteousness, and peace; which is, as thou hast heard [from me], the right kind of Gospel. . . . Therefore is the Epistle of James, in comparison with these, a mere letter of straw and

has nothing evangelical about it." Luther's confidence in his own infallibility became conviction of his own direct and unique inspiration. "I will go," he said, "to the Council of Trent; and may I lose my head, if I do not defend my opinions against all the world. What comes from my lips is not anger of mine but God's." Or again, "I have the Gospel not from man, but from heaven through our Lord Jesus Christ."

This was the first practical application of the Lutheran doctrine of private judgment, and is of necessity its classical illustration. It has been the fact, as was perhaps inevitable, that the working out of the principle in history should conform more or less closely to its exemplification in Luther himself. His rough and ready methods of criticism by applying all authority to the touchstone of his own opinion, his virtual confining of truth to the suggestions of his own intellect, were obviously applicable in more ways than one, and might be, as they have been, used in defending denials of what Luther held most dear. His private judgment affirmed justification by faith only; another judgment might as easily affirm the necessity of works. His judgment accepted miracle and believed in constant miracle; another judgment, following the same lines, might reject all miracle as such and every narrative and theory having miraculous elements. Many judgments have done this. The destructive criticism, calling itself rationalism, which has made most violent assaults on the Scriptural basis of the Christian religion, may trace its method and initial

impulse directly to Luther as source. Voltaire and the Encyclopedists in France, the Tübingen critics in Germany, and the Deists in England are almost as direct products of the Lutheran movement on its intellectual side as the Pietists and Schleiermacher are its products as exponents of the religious feeling. Luther stands at the beginning of two lines of development, and is as much responsible for the destructive rationalism as for the religious emotionalism, with which it has been in marked contrast and sharp conflict.

Modern religious history has exhibited an undue confidence in human reason to fathom mysteries beyond its scope, and an unnatural tendency to deny whatever cannot be immediately proven or understood. There has been an exaltation of reason, which is strikingly irrational; and dogmatic denial of the dogmas of faith on the strength of dogmatic assertion of all dogma's irrational character. Fear of superstitions of faith has often led to greater superstitions of incredulity. It is true that irrational faith in God is imperfect; but it is also true that some sort of faith in God is more rational than no faith, and less harmful than irrational scepticism. The rationalistic element in Protestantism has often neutralised the evangelical, since the net result of Protestant influence in some places has been not justification by greater faith, but the justification of little or no faith at all. The opposition to the overdogmatism of scholastic theology led first to new exhibitions of overdogmatism on the part of Protestant scholastics, and then to repudiation of

the dogmas of Scripture, whose authority Protestantism in theory accepts.

3. It is not surprising that Protestantism as exponent of individualism in religion should sometimes display an unguarded individualism. This may take various forms. In the sphere of intellect or emotion it may result in the substitution of figments of an undisciplined mind or imagination for the demonstrable truths or necessary postulates upon which sober and rational religion may be based. It may result in imperfect spiritual apprehension, because certain facts of spiritual consciousness are not related to others, which are equally facts of spiritual consciousness. Analogously, the individual may fail to relate himself to the society. It is not strange that a movement based on assertion of self-respect, self-help, and self-development should display the defects of those virtues. Protestantism has favoured the growth of a sturdy self-assurance, and it has also produced many forms of self-centred selfishness. It has, in every one of its many manifestations, led to disparagement, and sometimes to the overthrow, of the corporate, social side of Christianity. It starts as the struggle of an heroic individual against a mighty and corrupt corporation; and, as not infrequently has happened, has made the crude assumption that all corporations must invariably be wrong and all sturdy individuals invariably right. A slight experience of the great variety of sturdy individuals is sufficient to banish the latter error, though the perception of the true function of the corporation is a bit of wisdom more gradually ac-

quired. Unrestrained individualism leads to anarchy; and in the wake of all movements based on individualism, anarchy in some form has always appeared both in State and Church. Both civil and ecclesiastical anarchy have appeared as by-products of the Protestant Reformation. The interests of society as a whole have been sacrificed to the apparent needs of certain members of society; and the fact that these members happen in some cases to belong to less-favoured rather than to more favoured classes in no way alters the fact that this is a species of tyranny. The anarchist is invariably a tyrant. His method of asserting his own rights is virtual denial that any rights belong to others; and his method of self-protection is a conscienceless policy of "rule or ruin." Every species of pure selfishness, rude or refined, great or small, affecting the interests of few or many, belongs to the same category. The anarchist is only an individualist who has the logical, and possibly physical, courage to carry his premises to conclusions. The chief lesson taught by anarchy, appearing unrestricted either in the theory of the self-centred philosopher or in the violence of the professional assassin, is that unguarded individualism leads to impossible consequences; that it is an edge-tool which must be carefully manipulated; that it must be balanced by correlation with the corporate principle; that the individual misses his highest development when he fails to relate himself to his social environment.

The sturdy individualism of the modern period has accomplished excellent results by manly asser-

tion of the rights of the oppressed and by manly efforts to better their condition. But it has also often overstepped its proper limits. Some of the best examples of its rightful and effective operation have illustrated also its possible one-sidedness and susceptibility of abuse. Democracy, which is its political expression, has accomplished wonderful results, results never attained before the dawning of the democratic age, and attained nowhere at the present time where the spirit of democracy does not predominate. The spirit of true democracy teaches care for a weaker brother; but there are forms of democracy which are utterly selfish, and which miss their aim, because they are unthinking as well. Modern democracy has afforded not a few examples of the weakness and impossibility of its principles when unguardedly applied, many examples of the absurdity of assuming that every man is actually, or even potentially, a leader and ruler, or that the people as a whole can dispense with leadership and authority.

“Chaos, Cosmos! Cosmos, Chaos! once again the sickening
game;

Freedom, free to slay herself, and dying while they shout her
name.

Ye that woo the Voices—tell them ‘old experience is a fool,’
Teach your flattered kings that only they who cannot read can
rule.

Pluck the mighty from their seat, but set no meek ones in their
place;

Pillory Wisdom in your markets, pelt your offal in her face.

Tumble Nature heel o’er head, and, yelling with the yelling
street,

Set the feet above the brain, and swear the brain is in the feet.”

Democratic principles need to be safeguarded. The champions of individual right must always recognise not only the equal, but also the differing, rights of other individuals, the dependence of freedom for its maintenance upon choice of the fit to rule, and in all that concerns the religious life the paramount authority of Almighty God. Enlightened democracy endeavours to take careful account of the rights of all and to provide for the rightful exercise of authority; it never denies the Divine supremacy. Yet as matter of fact this last is largely ignored, and in many practical ways defied.¹

As a nation we have been learning important lessons of the need of safeguarding our democratic principles; and the recognition of this need has become clearer during the past twenty-five years. Problems arising from the Civil War and from the increase of immigration have made it apparent that we were in danger of carrying one set of our principles to impossibly one-sided conclusions. The soberness which is coming with national maturity is leading us to seek "life, freedom, and the pursuit

¹ Dr. Lyman Abbott in some recent studies of the *Spirit of Democracy* compares and contrasts the two lines of democratic development which have been most influential in this country, one having its source in English Puritanism, the other in French Jacobinism. He considers the former the truer type as having a theocratic basis.

"One was founded on faith in God, the other was untheistic, if not atheistic. To one the basis of all authority is the will of God; to the other, the will of the majority. . . . One desired to limit the suffrage to those who were obedient to the will of God, though they found it difficult to provide a satis-

of happiness" in ways which more fully recognise the claims of human brotherhood, if not those of Divine sonship. America of the early twentieth century is sensibly modifying the ideas which prevailed in America of the early nineteenth. Three illustrations may be given.

Our broader views of education strikingly demonstrate the way in which an individual conception may rise to a corporate conception. It is not long since education was thought of chiefly as an individual privilege, carefully to be guarded for the exclusive benefit of those who might be able to seek it. Public schools were levelling, and it was seen that they levelled downward; therefore, the best educated classes had little use for public schools. This was especially true in the South. Education was the privilege of the comparatively few. We still see the dangers of a downward levelling in public schools; but we are determined that they shall level upward: for we have come to believe in general education not only as a desirable form of philanthropy, but as a social necessity. It is not enough that a man be educated

factory test; the other believed in universal and unqualified suffrage. . . . One was social, the other individual. One tended toward co-operation, combination, organisation; the other toward competition. One looked forward toward realising the kingdom of God on earth, the other sought to return to a state of nature. The motto of one was the law of Christ: 'One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.' The motto of the other was the law of the forest: Struggle for existence, the survival of the fittest" (*Outlook* for June 18, 1910).

As a general description of two forms of democracy this

himself; he cannot lead a free life, unless he be one of a community of educated citizens. Individual enfranchisement can only come through social enfranchisement.

Again, we have learned that the mere wish to exercise authority is not sufficient proof of ability to exercise it. The theory of universal suffrage which seemed inseparable from our principles, has in all parts of the country been modified. Most see the need of limited suffrage, and there is a strong tendency to have it more and more strictly limited. The standard of requirements is being raised at the same time that every effort is being made to enable more and more citizens to satisfy the requirements. But it is clearly seen that just government consists in something more than "the consent of the governed," since too often have the governed consented to things which almost immediately they proclaimed not "just." It is recognised on all sides that only in a carefully limited sense can we assert that "all men are created free and equal." We have learned not to confuse the ideal with the actual.

Again, we are learning more to recognise in the background of our political life absolute standards of law and authority. We do not assume so readily could scarcely be improved upon, although it cannot be applied to the historical types under discussion without qualification. There have been noble strains and marked altruism in certain phases of developments from the French source; and there has been an immense amount of cold-hearted and cold-blooded selfishness inherited direct from the Pilgrim Fathers. As has been aptly noted, "As soon as they landed they fell on their knees; and then they got up and fell on the aborigines!"

as our grandfathers the infallibility of paper-constitutions, or the certainty of arriving at truth and justice through the excitement of conventions. We have seen too many paper-constitutions made and made over; and the uncomfortable suspicion sometimes arises in our minds that popular election does not invariably determine the fittest to survive. We do not believe that ultimate political authority rests with chance-majorities; but are striving more and more to relate the authority we recognise to the eternal laws of right and wrong. It is not enough to know that a thing is legal, or that it is constitutional; we wish also to know whether it is right. We have at the present time a prophetic element in our politics which, after all due reservations have been made, is a sign of movement toward readjustment of political conceptions and practices by relating them more directly to the Kingdom of God. The idea of the Kingdom brings in the sense of corporate responsibility and of ultimate authority, by which a selfish individualism translated into forms of democratic government needs to be guarded. The need of this has shown itself in our political history. We have had, and have, too much individualism; and we are trying to remedy defects.

Precisely the same sort of thing is true of our religious development. It is impossible for any fair-minded student of the times, or for any lover of humanity and of the Christian Church, to shut his eyes to the threat of complete disaster to the Christian cause due to the present disintegration of

Christendom; nor, however much he may admire the virility of Protestant character and the stability of Protestant achievements, can he fail to see that this disintegration is due to the centrifugal tendencies of Protestant individualism. For it is a fundamental assumption of popular Protestantism that every man is free to choose his own religion and his own church; and this is so interpreted as to mean that he is free to invent them. A man is *not*, in any absolute sense, free to choose his religion and his church. Religion is his knowledge of God, and the Church his method of entering into relation with God; and both are determined by the unchangeableness of the Divine Nature and the Divine Revelation. Upon man depends his own degree of apprehension of Divine truth; but the truth remains fixed outside himself. It represents God; and until a man recognises that Religion and Church have to do with God, and that all that he can do is to seek and submit to Divine guidance and Divine authority, he cannot know the ABC of religion.

We shrink from anything which seems to deny, or to restrict, human freedom. Yet a little thought and common-sense show how many limits there are to freedom. A man is not free to choose his family, his nation, his equipment for developing character, all of them things intimately concerning his inmost personality, exclusively concerning himself. Much more is he not free to choose, in the sense of to invent, what relates to God. Moreover, there can only be freedom within the spheres of truth and righteousness. It is a contradiction in terms to say

that a man is *free* to believe or to tell lies, to steal or to be robbed, to murder or to be murdered. Analogously, he is only free to know the truth and to experience the truth about God. His freedom consists in his being bound. He is free to become free; and that is all. He is free to choose whether he will correspond with the revelation and requirements made by God Himself. He has freedom of the kind which, recognising the different means of approach to God due to the "diversities of operations of the same Spirit," has to choose the line of his own first approach; but in his exercise of freedom he must never forget that he is creature seeking to apprehend truth concerning his Creator, that he is human son trying to enter into correspondence with the Divine Father. He has no freedom of a kind that can deal with God on equal terms. He is not free to determine anything concerning God Himself, although he has been made free to determine his own personal relation to God. He is only free to choose his slavery.

"Thou wilt not leave us in the dust :
Thou madest man, he knows not why.
He thinks he was not made to die;
And Thou hast made him : Thou art just.

"Thou seemest human and Divine,
The holiest, highest manhood, Thou ;
Our wills are ours we know not how ;
Our wills are ours to make them Thine."

Man can only approach God in the spirit of prayer, and can only accept what comes from God in the spirit of humble thanksgiving.

The spirit of self-help and self-respect has always to be on its guard against becoming self-centred; and if it fails to escape this danger, the self-centred character makes a religion of self and leaves God out of it. With fine intentions of maintaining a strong and valiant humanity, it maims humanity by making it fall short of its true climax in conscious sonship. Any system which tends to make men feel themselves critics of God and His Church, or discriminating patrons of religions and churches, and dims man's sense that he can only approach God as a penitent sinner and trustful child, cannot fail to harm the cause of religion, which it degrades, even if it does not destroy. Protestantism with its ultra-individualism has to a great extent done this, and chiefly in two ways: (1) it has largely abandoned the conception of the Christian Church as mystical Body of Christ; and (2) it has to a great extent lost the spirit of worship.

The weakening of hold on the Church idea has come in two ways. In the first place, over-insistence on individual right has led to an obscuring of the corporate sense, and, as was perhaps inevitable, Church was affected more than State. In the second place, the new impetus given to social organisation on democratic lines for secular purposes has naturally and rightly led to similar organisation for religious and ecclesiastical purposes; and this has led to radical departure from Christian principle whenever these democratic organisations have been viewed as substitutes for the Church inaugurated by Christ. The democratic principle has its place in

Christianity. Not only are Christians free citizens in a free Kingdom; they are more than that, free sons in the Father's house. There is no liberty so perfect as "the glorious liberty of the sons of God." But the condition of enjoying that liberty is the self-surrender of individual faith. To ignore this condition is to seek a religion which is without God and, therefore, without hope.

The natural polity of unguarded democracy or Protestantism is Congregationalism, which is individualism practically applied. The theory that any congregation may adopt for itself creed and church-polity (with the corollary that every man may choose his congregation) is nothing more than expression of the principle that every man may invent creed and church for himself. This is not New Testament Christianity. The Creed was to summarise a "faith once delivered," giving the substance of a revelation from Almighty God. The Church was a society inaugurated by Christ and continuously animated by Him, as a means of bringing about mystical union with Himself. For the Divinely-inspired Church humanly-devised organisations are no substitute. Any assertion of individual human rights which weakens conviction that our relation to God is one of dependence, falls into the capital error which evoked our Lord's sternest denunciation, the self-complacency of the Pharisees.

The democratic principle may not be directly applied to the bases of religion. God does not reign by popular election; nor do His laws for their validity need initial endorsement by special commit-

tees. The Church of God is not a republic of this world, but a Kingdom not of this world; and as citizens of that Kingdom we must recognise—if we may use earthly terms—that the Ruler of that Kingdom is an Absolute Monarch. Authority emanates solely from Him; and men can only obey it as loyal subjects. Democratic principle has its place in the method of God's dealing with us and in our method of approach toward Him; but it has not determined the character of redemption through the Church, nor does it indicate the character and source of the Divine authority.

These are not meaningless platitudes. Down at the bottom of many of our difficulties at the present day, as one great cause of the disunion of Christendom, lies the false assumption that the social aspect of religion must correspond to the social aspect of secular politics. The ideals of a democratic age have obscured, and in some cases destroyed, any true sense of the meaning of the Kingdom of God. Much popular Protestantism has lost the feeling of man's dependence on God, and all humility of attitude toward the means of redemption established by His Son. The sense that the Church is a Divine society has been dulled where it has not been lost. Signs of reaction have begun to appear, of which one of the most striking is the emphasis on the function and meaning of the Kingdom of God in the later writings of Albrecht Ritschl.¹

¹ Such statements as these are open to criticism for discrepancy with well-known facts; but as a generalisation they may stand. E.g., the Sovereignty of God and the irresistible char-

4. Another disastrous consequence of Protestant influence is the widespread loss of the spirit of worship. This follows from the weakening of the sense of dependence upon Divine grace. Making church merely a meeting-house, unwillingness to kneel in prayer, represent something more than mere change in outward form through substitution of the simple and genuine for the complicated and formal. They indicate a change in spirit, which tends to drag worship down to the level of the commonplace. If church be no more than association of one man with his fellows for religious debate, a meeting-house is all that is necessary. If service be only intercourse between man and his fellow-men, there is no need for attitudes of humble prostration. We all of us know something of what pass as prayers in many Protestant churches. They often breathe the spirit of highest devotion (and when they do, they not infrequently adopt the language of the historic liturgies); but more often they are argumentative

acter of His decrees have been more strongly asserted by Calvinism than by any other form of modern Christianity. The first aim and consequence of Calvinism was to train men in the fear of God. Yet the actual result of its influence in the long run has been to train strong men who have more and more ceased to fear a God Whom they had not been equally trained to love, and who have come more and more to rely on themselves and their own powers of will, until God has been largely left out of account. Modern Calvinism does not tremble before the Almighty's predestinating decrees; it debates as to how far the Constitutional Executive of the Universe may be trusted to act in independence of legislatures elected by itself.

harangues, addressed to an audience in which the Deity is included, rather than expressions of the penitence of sinful souls in the presence of God. Men with a deep sense of the meaning of the Divine could not utter them.

Similarly, church-music and sermons are regarded as artistic performances; and the general character of "worship" is that of lecture on religion and sacred concert. This conception represents a standard to which the Protestant Episcopal Church along with others is only too disposed to live down. The great and flagrant fact of the decay of the spirit of worship, that is, the spirit of prayer, in spite of the caricatures which go by these names, is writ large across the history of modern Christianity, and more than anything else proclaims the inadequacy of the system it represents. There has been a widespread vulgarisation of religion and religious worship which, although due to a worthy desire to make religion homely and practical, has nevertheless done irreparable harm to moral and spiritual character by relinquishing the first idea of religion, namely, that it deals with *God*, and the first idea of worship, namely, that it is intended to *elevate*. Man is to be lifted up to heaven, not the things of heaven to be dragged down to earthiness.

5. It is a grave fault and handicap, and ought to be obviously self-condemning, for any religious system to be predominantly negative. Neither Christianity nor any other religion can be strongly built on what men do *not* believe. Protestantism

has always given prominence to its negations, largely because of the handicap of an unfortunate name. Its real strength has been due to the positive evangelical truth, which it was its mission to reassert; but it has often felt that its one function and virtue was to *protest*, to make a religion of the confession of other people's sins! That sort of confession deserves no absolution. The Earl of Clarendon's description of the Scottish Covenanters is a true characterisation of more than one class of Protestants: "Their whole religion consists in an entire detestation of Popery, in believing the Pope to be Anti-Christ, and in hating perfectly the persons of all papists and of those who do not hate them." "Entire detestation" can never constitute a religion, least of all the religion of Christ, which is perfect love. There can be no special virtue in detesting the Pope or any one else; not even detestation of the Devil and all his works can be religious, unless it assume a subordinate character as one aspect of positive, burning love of God. Religion must be always of the mind and heart, not merely of the hind-legs!

But much Protestantism has been, and is, mere negation, negation not only of certain claims of Popes, but of the supernatural elements in Christianity. Its protest has been ultimately directed against the mystical element in the Sacraments, in the Church, in human life. It has rebelled at all mystery, at anything beyond comprehension, at anything demanding effort to rise above the worldly and the commonplace. This restiveness at the claims

of the mystical and the supernatural has been the characteristic sign of a drifting further and further from apprehension of the first principles of the Incarnation and of all religion; and it can only be cured by recognising the need of positive devotion to the positive truths proclaimed by Jesus Christ. We must supersede "What am *I* going to believe, because it commends itself to me?" much more "What am I *not* going to believe, because it does not commend itself to me?" by "What did our Lord Himself teach, that I may believe and live?" "A religion without mystery is a religion without God;" and any religious system showing a practical tendency to minimise and eliminate the Divine may survive as a system, but as a religion it must soon become extinct.

The Protestant Reformation gave effective expression to the great truth of religious individualism, which most needed emphasis at the time of its occurrence, in what was apparently the most effective way at the time. The impetus it gave to the mind and conscience of the modern world has been the cause of some of the greatest spiritual blessings which the world enjoys. It was provoked by violent assertions of one side of Christian truth, so closely associated with abuses as inevitably to provoke reaction of a violent kind. The responsibility for this must rest largely upon those who provoked it. But even in its beginnings it was marked by one-sidedness in another direction; and, as time has gone on, it has become more and more out of focus. It has fostered personal faith and piety of a sturdy kind, and devo-

tion to the authoritative standards of primitive Christian days; but, on the other hand, it has obscured the corporate sense in religion; it has opposed the sacramental principle in Christianity and in life; it has tended to keep religion and piety on commonplace levels.

After three hundred and fifty years of it, we can see the need of redressing the balance. It is perhaps less inevitable in this age than in times past that violent reaction should be succeeded by violent counter-reaction. With broader vision than our ancestors had, even with less opportunity for deliberation than fell to their lot, we ought to be able to readjust the claims and relations of complementary truths, and obtain balance by combination of them in a way never before possible. We have a plain duty of trying to overcome the effects of Protestant one-sidedness. We wish to recognise its positive virtues and achievements, and to keep them and their results; yet appreciation of these cannot blind us to its failures. The evidence of these is clear in the history of the recent past, and confronts us in the present condition of Christendom. To remedy defects there is need of plain speaking, of true criticism, just not only in its sympathy but also in its severity. The application of the criticism must be made first at home, and the application of remedy first in our own house. We have motes and beams of our own to attend to before we undertake the work of optical specialists. There is need among ourselves of new realisation of the supernatural character of the Church as a consequence of the super-

natural character of our Lord; and if, when we are ourselves converted, we are to strengthen our brethren, we must remember that the most persuasive apologetic is illustration by a brotherhood of men of the spirit of worship translated into the beauty of holiness.¹

¹ It would be impossible to emphasise the main point of this paper more forcibly than in the language of Dr. Newman Smyth, which is all the more forcible as coming from a Congregationalist.

“It were an easy and grateful task to depict the splendid successes of Protestantism. Our free churches have their glory in them. They are the pride of our New England inheritance. They are the ancestral virtues upon which our homes are built. They are the constitutional foundations of our American citizenship. They constitute the historic security of democracy throughout the world. They have opened the door wide for all sciences to come into our modern civilisation; and they have made thought as free as the angel whom the early Christian prophet saw flying through mid-heaven with an everlasting evangel. Protestantism has its triumphal arch, and upon it are depicted the victories of hard-fought fields, and the procession of the mighty oppressors of the nations led captive by it; and the names of the heroes of its faith remain inscribed in perpetual honour upon it. But it is a completed arch. Its crowning achievement is the victory which it has won forever for the spiritual liberty of the individual man. . . . This key-stone has been placed secure for all time in the triumphal arch of Protestantism, and no powers of darkness shall remove it from its place. In the main the distinctive work of Protestants as Protestants has been done. Hereafter there may remain the lesser and decreasing labour of extending civil liberty to remoter regions, or in Christian lands of adding here and there some finishing touches to the Reformation’s historic masterpiece of the Emancipation of the Spiritual Man. Henceforth the truth is free which makes us free. In this fulfilment

of its providential mission lies the sign of the passing of the Protestant age. For a work achieved is always the sign of another and greater work to be accomplished.

"We may justly reason that a movement of the religious thought and life, which has already passed through two marked stages of development—the epoch of protest and era of reconstruction—is a providential preparation for something beyond itself; as our civil war and the subsequent period of reconstruction have proved to be only an epoch of transition into a greater nationality. There lies before us in its vaster possibility another Christian age to come. Already we are feeling its problems. Shall the Protestant era—its religious warfare accomplished, and its confused years of reconstruction drawing happily to a close—issue in a grander Catholicism? The answer of faith is—the grander Catholicism is already at the door."

"For Christianity must become the mastery of human life, or it is not the final religion. If our existing forms of religion are losing such control, we must look for another coming of the Son of Man as One having authority. Now it is just this loss of religious authority which the churches of the Reformation must confess. At this point we are not dealing with causes, but facing facts. We have to do with actual human conditions. Exceptions there may be in many places; and compensations for apparent loss. But putting these for the moment one side, and looking broadly at the facts of life, we must admit the relaxation of authority in our Protestant churches" (Smyth: *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*, pp. 11f, 8, 14).

The gist of Dr. Smyth's message is: Protestantism has given us freedom; but that freedom for its security demands a revival of authority. This means something more than that church-authority must be called in to check religious individualism. It means that there must be fuller appreciation of the unique authority of Him, who is Head of the Church. He is a Person not to discuss, but to obey. The idea of authority can never be separated from thought of its Source. This is the significance of Bishop Hobart's motto, "Evangelical

Truth and Apostolic Order." The Truth of the Gospel is a Person, and Order and Authority emanate from Him.

If we are to revive and emphasise the idea of authority, that idea must first be expressed, not in the exercise of authority, but by submission to it. Only they can command who know how to obey. We cannot win the world by assertion, though we may make progress by humility. We are pledged to maintain the claims and the authority of our Lord and of His Church; but we can only do so as we translate the evangelical spirit into a truly apostolic obedience.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

VI

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

Ephesians iv: 4f. There is one Body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all, Who is above all and through all and in you all.

WE need often to think and speak of the Unity of the Church, for the time has come when we cannot avoid sober and serious consideration of what is meant by the oneness of the Christian Church, no matter what the intellectual perplexities of grappling with one of the most difficult of all problems, and no matter what the discomforts of a discussion likely to occasion controversy. The first thing we say of the Church, in professing our belief in it, is that it is *one*; and the great problem of the day is, How can we reconcile this theory of oneness with the fact of a disintegrated Christendom? and, How can we do something to translate theory into some sort of practical reality? The divisions of Christendom are not of our making, but their perpetuation depends in part, possibly in special degree, upon our generation. A longing for unity has seized so firmly upon a large portion of the Christian world that it is inevitable that something will be done by way of remedy; and it is most important that that something be wise, and

in the end really effective. In the hurry of our lives, we are wont to seek short-cuts to the ends of long roads, and to adopt rough-and-ready methods for delicate undertakings. We are awake to the dangers of supersensitive caution, which, for fear of doing wrong, does—that greatest of wrongs—nothing at all; but we are not equally awake to the possible dangers of impatient rashness. We may be afraid of rashness; but we are rather proud of impatience: and impatience is one of the worst sorts of rashness. We admire prompt action; and in a desire to act promptly often act unthinkingly. And thus we defeat our own best aims. What we most need is an aggressive charity and a sober resolution. There is much false charity, in reality an inane indifference which leads to no results; and there is much resolution, which is unthinking and therefore dangerous. But aggressiveness in charity and soberness in resolution are not impossible, and they are absolutely necessary, if we are to work for the unity of our Lord's Church in our Lord's own way. That is the aim which must be kept constantly before our eyes, *our Lord's work in our Lord's way*. Too often we impose our ways upon His work, and the work suffers in consequence. Often with the best intentions in the world of doing His work, we forget to ask whether there is any way of His own appointment for going about it, and, if so, what that way is.

So of the great Unity-problem, we are trying hard to devise unities, and to make ourselves think that unities exist where they do not; we sometimes blunder along in ways of our own with eyes tight-shut, and

think and boast that we are doing God service. And all the time, there are great principles set as guides for all we do for the unity of the Church, if we had but the will to look for them, and sense and conscience to see them. Not that the application of the principles, once recognised, is either obvious or easy; but the mere disposition to look at certain things written large on the face of the Gospel and Christian history would save us from making shallow mistakes, and from committing old sins in new ways.

1

There are two common modes of approach to the problem of unity, the reasons for which we all feel, and the motives for which we all share. Yet they cannot stand the rigorous tests of Scriptural standards, if we expose them to keen scrutiny.

1. There is the scheme of seeking unity upon an undogmatic basis, that is, a unity of agreement that nobody shall think anything definite; or that if he does, he shall not say what it is, or expect any one else to think the same. The reason that this appeals to us in greater or less degree is that we are weary of wranglings, and deplore disagreements among Christians. We wish to do away with possible causes of controversy; and we attempt it by trying to do away with thought, or at least with the expression of thought. We all recognise the need of reverent agnosticism in approaching what relates to the life of eternity, and, for that matter, to the explanation of life now. We know that great harm has been done to the cause of religion by the over-dogmatism of

those who have striven to be wise beyond what is written. But in our insistence that there are many things which we cannot know, and that some people have done mischief by trying to know, or pretending to know, too much, we forget that after all there is much that we do know, and much more that we are bound to try to know; and that there is no sort of unity, in thought or in practical life, which has not for its basis positive truth. Christian unity is based upon the Christian truth, upon as much of it as we can gain; and with no definite certainty for basis, there can be nothing but a fanciful superstructure in practice. No unity worth much can ever be fabricated out of mere agreement not to try to agree about anything. And yet that is precisely what undogmaticism amounts to.

The people who are most consistent in making the undogmatic experiment are the great Unitarians. They assume certain great dogmas, the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and are sometimes dogmatic in denials of what others may be allowed to believe; but, on the whole, their attempt to do away with dogma is the most consistent which has been, or is being, made; and the results of the undogmatic hypothesis are best seen in their great teachers. Moreover, the union of a minimum of dogma with a maximum of intellectual culture and philanthropic activity is illustrated by the life they advocate. Any fair-minded observer, whether he agree with them or not, must regard them as the best examples of the application of certain principles, which for them are an avowed creed, and for

many others an unavowed, though influential, ideal. The reasons for adopting it are patent to all of us; but if we study its character and history carefully, we can scarcely fail to see that, while much is said of everything in general, the only practical result is the apotheosis of the nothing in particular. Unitarianism frankly abandons definite Gospel Christianity; and we ought to see clearly that the principles upon which it is based inevitably lead to that abandonment.

2. There is also the American Protestant scheme of unity, a definite grappling with the problem closest at hand which makes strong appeal to all the good principle we possess. There is no mistaking that the time is ripe for action along this line, and no doubt of our duty to take advantage of the opportunity. Now is the time when something can be done; and therefore now is the time when something must be done. And in going about it, though we may avoid the extreme of consistency in seeking to do away with dogma, we are disposed to reduce what we call "our common Christianity" to its lowest terms, to seek a religion of minimums, which, when examined, may be seen to have little solidity, and in its aim at breadth to have attained nothing but flatness. (The narrowness of the vertical is bad; but the narrowness of the horizontal is worse.) There are more ways than one of trying to make something out of nothing; and the process often involves the destruction of the something first.

In thinking of practical problems, we are sometimes disposed to identify American Protestantism

with Christianity. If this were absolutely true, or even relatively true from the practical standpoint, the key to solution of the problem would probably lie with Presbyterians or Methodists. American Presbyterianism has a splendid record for religious depth and spiritual activity, and has always displayed a thorough Americanism. In its modified form, now everywhere prevalent, it is as fine an example as can be found of the development of Puritanism. It has both intellectual and moral fibre for the building up of the strongest sort of American Protestant character. Similarly, Methodism with its numerical superiority, its unique work in great sections of the country, its approximately undogmatic teaching, especially when taken in connection with the work of the Baptists, with which it has much in common, would give an obviously effective basis for American Protestant Union. Methodism with its numbers infused with Presbyterian intelligence and spirit would form a capital amalgam for American work.

But American Protestantism is not Christendom, and no striking an average for the purpose of bringing together American Protestants would serve an equal purpose for Christendom. Not that this would not be good in itself, since any reduction in the number of divisions is so much gain; but movement in one flank of the Christian host must not be mistaken for movement in the whole; and movement for unity cannot effect so much, if confined to the left wing, as it would if exerted from the centre. It would be a fatal tactical mistake for any Church to abandon what gave right to claim place in the Christian cen-

tre for the sake of closer identification with the interests of those on one of the sides. We cannot deal with any great question without sense of proportion; and no consideration of Christian unity has proportion if it ignore any of the factors in the problem, or refuse to study the essential nature of the problem itself. No part must so engross attention as to divert interest from the whole; nor must temporary considerations, prominent at one time, obscure those which are permanent for all time. Our special interest in the welfare of American Protestantism must not blind us to the welfare of Christendom as a whole.

But more fundamental than any disproportion in our interest in parts of the problem is an erroneous assumption we make in many attempts to approach it. We start with the idea that we have various churches which we wish to bring closer together. We have made them; and we wish to make the common platform on which they can all unite. The unity, like the churches, must be made and managed by ourselves. There is truth in this as a description of the actual situation; and, so far as it is true, it measures a radical and dangerous departure from Christian principle. We *have* all of us made churches, and we should all of us *like* to make unities. And when we have done that, or do it, we are abandoning the New Testament way of viewing things and the primitive way of dealing with them. There is only one Church; and that is our Lord's: and only one unity, and that is His too. Our churches are not Churches in the same sense as His; nor would

•

our unities be the unity of the Spirit maintained in the bond of peace. As matter of fact, our churches, in so far as they have been devised merely by ourselves, have amounted to very little in comparison with the Gospel standard; and as for our unities, they have amounted to just nothing at all. Just so far as church-activity has been reduced to a purely human plane, so that what is a Kingdom-not-of-this-world has been treated as a series of modern-republics-very-much-of-this-world, modern Christian history is scrawled all over with the unmistakable mark Failure! We must revert to the Scriptural theories of the Church and Unity before we can hope to be in the way of working effectively. It is a common fault of Christians of all names that they have, in various ways, thought of the Church in such a way as to leave our Lord out of account. There is an immense amount of virtual Unitarianism among those who profess to accept Christ as Divine, and to hold to the New Testament conception of the Church. This is true whenever we think of Him merely as an august figure in the past rather than as a vital force in the present; and whenever, though we talk of His present activity, we fail to take Him into account in practical affairs. We can only make definite progress toward a position from which to work for unity if, all together, we try to learn afresh the forgotten lesson of the mystical Church of the New Testament, and of the unity in it for those who choose to submit to our Lord Himself, working in His own Church in His own way.

2

In marked contrast with our common conceptions are those of St. Paul; and the conceptions of St. Paul correspond exactly to those given by our Lord. In St. Paul there is no hint that church-unity means a confederation of churches composed of special followers of a number of eminent Christians. It is true that such an idea obtrudes from the outside for a moment as a cause of division among the Corinthians; but St. Paul impatiently sets it aside. He makes it clear that no churches with human founders are to be confused with the one Church of Christ. Nor was unity to be effected by colourless and characterless combination on a basis of a superstitious dread of the definite. Like St. John, he only conceives of definite union on a basis of definite truth.

His great classical statement of the principles of unity is that passage from the Epistle to the Ephesians from which the text was taken. "*There is one Body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all, Who is above all and through all and in you all. But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. . . . He hath given some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto the measure of the stature of the*

fulness of Christ: that henceforth we be no more children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into Him in all things, which is the Head even Christ, from Whom the whole Body, fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the Body unto the edifying of itself in love."

It is only possible to enumerate the main points, each one of which might be subject for a treatise. First, the Church is the embodiment of the character of God Himself, "the fulness—complete expression—of Him that filleth all things." Second, it is the mystical instrument of Christ's activity, "Body" connected with Him ascended as "Head." Third, it derives all life and activity from Him as Source. "When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive and gave gifts unto men." Fourth, though there are many members, they are not independent, but are united with each other through Him. Fifth, this Body is one, and its oneness comes from Him. "*From Whom the whole Body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the Body unto the edifying of itself in love."*

The unity of the mystical Church, like every other good and perfect gift, is something that *cometh from above*. Our fundamental mistake is that we are for-

ever trying to devise it from below. We would sometimes like, by a comparison of our respective notions, to fabricate some sort of universally-to-be-accepted Christ. We first; then our notions; then Christ. The New Testament order is different. *One Lord, one faith, one baptism.* The true theory of unity consists in working out the meaning of that. We must first agree on the one Lord, that is, that our Lord shall really be given first place. We are farther from that than we think. If we could but do *that*, we should be making progress. Then, the one Lord must be apprehended by one faith, not only one interpretation of the meaning of His Person and Life, the one faith of the Scriptures and Creeds, the external faith of one opinion about Christ, but also the inner, individual, moral faith of one attitude toward Christ. "One faith" means not so much unanimity in doctrine as universal self-surrender. And when there be universal self-surrender, there can be no hesitancy about reception of the universal consecration implied in "one baptism."

The "one baptism" stands for everything in the one Church. It is the anointing of the Holy Spirit which makes the Church, and this is first given to every member in Baptism. Baptism makes the Church, and includes or typifies every form of spiritual infusion which the Church in any part of its life receives. Any insistence we lay upon the necessity of Church, or Sacraments, or Ministry, is due to the fact that these are part of the connotation of the "one Baptism." To paraphrase St. Paul's enumeration, unity comes from accepting the "one

Lord" by one complete surrender of self to Him. This is the "one faith." The result and reward of this is spiritual anointing, "one baptism." This constitutes, in various forms, the essence of the life of that one Church composed of those who in baptism have received the Spirit. All theories of Christology and Ecclesiology, and all effective plans for practical work, are comprised in that classic statement of the order for thoughts of unity. And from these follow unities greater still. We might have expected the unity of God to stand first. But, according to St. Paul's order, we only come to apprehend the "one God and Father of us all" after our unity with the "one Lord" has been consummated in the "one baptism."

The spiritual unity of members of the one spiritual Body is not a mechanical unity. The various members perform their respective functions according to a law of variety, which is of Divine appointment; but they are connected with each other by virtue of union with the Head. Unity comes not by active process, but by passive. Complete surrender to Christ brings about union with those who have made the same surrender. We are working along the best line for unity when we spread the evangelical spirit of complete surrender to the Person of Christ. Men who have given themselves to Him will accept His Church and everything in it for His sake. We may help each other to make the great surrender, to possess the "one faith," to accept the "one baptism"; but we must wait for the unity as a gift from Him, sent to His Church as the possibilities of the one

baptism are more and more realised. St. Paul would seem to say that there is no such thing as immediate unity of members—a unity effected by their uniting themselves—only power of closer union with the Head, the one medium of unity, through whom they are brought closer to each other.

This reflects the language of our Lord Himself when He made His great High-Priestly prayer for the unity of His Church. *“I have manifested Thy Name unto the men which Thou gavest Me out of the world; Thine they were, and Thou gavest them Me, and they have kept Thy Word. . . . I have given them the words which Thou gavest Me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came from Thee, and they have believed that Thou hast sent Me.”* There is explanation of the meaning of “one faith.” *“Sanctify them through Thy truth: Thy word is truth. As Thou hast sent Me into the world, even so have I sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they may be one in Us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them (There is a wonderful assertion of the Divine character of the Church.), that they all may be one, even as We are one: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect into one; that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them as Thou hast*

loved Me." Unity of the Church is the end of His coming into the world, the special means of converting the world. Its source is Divine, and its pattern Divine. It is effected not by any action of the believers moving toward each other, but as consequence of Divine indwelling. *I in them, and Thou in Me;* the unity of the Godhead is mediated to the Church through Christ, the Church's Head. *That they may be made perfect into one.* It is a gradual process; but a process to which men submit, not one which they contrive. And in the Church there can be realisation of all that goes to make up the life and character of God—what St. Paul calls "fulness." *"I have declared unto them Thy Name, and will declare it: that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them. When Jesus had spoken these words, He went forth with His disciples over the brook Cedron, where there was a garden, into which He entered with His disciples. And Judas also which betrayed Him knew the place."* Our Lord's last full and free words spoken in the presence of the Apostles were a prayer to the Father that His Church in all ages to come should be brought into one through apprehension of Divine truth, and should be filled with Divine love. Does this seem dreamy, unpractical, remote from anything useful or susceptible of direct application? It is only repetition of the teaching of the Apostles and of their Lord, repetition of the only things which come from sources to be regarded as having authority. And the history of the Church shows that men have only made practical advance in the work of the Church when

they have reverted to these mystical, Divine, first principles and have appreciated the truth—to quote the motto of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew—that “there is nothing more practical than spirituality.”

But “Men and brethren, what shall we *do*?” Several things, which are plainly in accordance with the Divine plan and order for unity.

First, we can study and teach the primitive Gospel of the Living Christ. This is very little studied and taught at present. The common presentation of our Lord, excellent as it is as far as it goes, falls lamentably short of the presentation given by the Apostles. We can enter upon an educational campaign, the avowed object of which is to propagate the Gospel of the Ascension and Pentecost. That is, that He is in our midst *now*, moving in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, holding the seven stars in His right hand; that He is first factor in every practical problem.

Second, we can draw nearer to our fellow-Christians through intercessory prayer. By bringing them with ourselves into our communions with our Lord, we shall be getting nearer to them through Him. We consistently use general prayers for unity; but we may make little specific, detailed intercession. We are trying sympathetically to learn more of Christians of other Communions than our own. The practical consequence should be earnest and intelligent prayer. Any one of us would have made a definite step toward the temper of Christian unity if, in moments of drawing closest to God, he were to pray not merely for members of his own Church in all

parts of the world, but also as earnestly and intently as he knew how for the Pope, the Greek Patriarchs, the Russian missionaries, the Scottish Presbyterians, the American Baptists, the Salvation Army, or for any other combination of representative Christians, which would suggest the extent and the complexity of the Christian problem. There are many undeveloped possibilities along this line, and the Missionary Conference in Edinburgh has set a stimulating example.

Third, we can recognise that no one form of Christianity represents fully and perfectly the faith and practice of the New Testament Church; but that there is a "coming Catholicity," the common property of us all, to which we all have important contributions to make. Our aim is not to force one form of existing Christianity on others, or to devise of ourselves some new form for that purpose; but, knowing that the Divine unity is something toward which we must *grow*, we can strive to train our children for that more perfect thing which is coming in the future. The New Testament gives a standard, a goal, the time for reaching which it is not in our power to determine; but we can help each other to *face* the goal, and cultivate a unity in ambition and effort, though we be following different lines of approach.

Too little heed is paid to the New Testament standard, our Lord's standard; and we can do much by claiming for it its rightful place, by trying to secure for St. Paul a new hearing for the doctrine of "one Lord, one faith, one baptism." Let us stop

trying to unite ourselves for Christ's benefit, in the sense that we are trying to make over Him and His Church for our own benefit. Let us seek more earnestly to be united through Him as the only Source and the only Bond of Unity. That is the first great postulate of the unity-problem, and the first factor for all practical work. This we must recognise before we can hope for progress.

Nor need we be hopeless that God will soon do great things in preparing the factions and fractions of Christendom to receive the gift of unity. It is no impossible dream that the great Roman Communion with its splendid record of consistent witness to the supernatural, which is the secret of its strength, and its allegiance to the ideal of a Divinely-inspired Church, should, as many of its members are doing, look more and more behind the Church to the Church's Lord and detect the signs of His Spirit in many of those from whom it now holds aloof; that the Greeks, with their unflinching loyalty to the ideal of one faith, should feel more and more that faith has a Personal Source and Personal Goal; that Protestantism, with its splendid aim of free personal union with God in conscious sonship, should feel more and more the workings of His free Spirit in the Church, and should cease denunciation of other Christians' sins long enough for a little penitential recognition of its own; that even Protestant Episcopalianism should be roused from its smug littleness to some apprehension of the Catholicity taught by St. Paul and St. John. We need not think of these things as impossible if we have living faith

in a Living Lord; and the mere thought of these things helps to develop a temper receptive of unity. We are very much "like children, tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine"; but our Lord, who at first gave divers gifts to divers men, can still fit us to make some contribution to His work, "for the edifying of the Body of Christ: till we all come into the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto perfect manhood, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

280.3Q

K617p

Kinsman, F. J. Bp. of Delaware

Principles of Anglicanism

1911			1912		
Jan 18	Acknowledged	Feb 21	Jan 12	D. Miller	June 25

280.3Q

K617p

